

The Entrepreneurial Quest for Emancipation: Trade-Offs, Practices, and Outcomes in an Indigenous Context

Albena Pergelova, Fernando Angulo-Ruiz, Leo-Paul Dana

The final publication is available at Springer via

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-021-04894-1>

Permanent link to this version <https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14078/2877>

License All Rights Reserved

Journal of Business Ethics

The Entrepreneurial Quest for Emancipation: Trade-Offs, Practices, and Outcomes in an Indigenous Context --Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	BUSI-D-21-00199R2	
Article Type:	Original Paper	
Full Title:	The Entrepreneurial Quest for Emancipation: Trade-Offs, Practices, and Outcomes in an Indigenous Context	
Section/Category:	Small Business, Entrepreneurship and Business Ethics - Julia Roloff	
Keywords:	emancipation; search for autonomy; economic and non-economic outcomes	
Corresponding Author:	Albena Pergelova, Ph.D. MacEwan University Edmonton, AB CANADA	
Corresponding Author E-Mail:	pergelovaa@macewan.ca	
Order of Authors:	Albena Pergelova, Ph.D. Fernando Angulo-Ruiz Leo-Paul Dana	
Funding Information:	MacEwan University	Dr. Fernando Angulo-Ruiz
Abstract:	<p>This paper builds on theoretical developments that view entrepreneurship as emancipation, i.e., entrepreneurial activities as generators of change and pursuit of freedom from perceived constraints. Using a representative dataset of 1,095 SMEs owned by Indigenous entrepreneurs in Canada, the authors investigate how pursuit of this freedom affects: (i) the way entrepreneurs enact several aspects of their ventures; and (ii) the performance outcomes achieved. Findings reveal how the initial motivations of entrepreneurs (seeking change for the social collective of which they are a part vs. seeking autonomy for themselves) lead to distinct business practices, which in turn impact differentially entrepreneurial outcomes.</p>	
Additional Information:		
Question	Response	
1. Is the manuscript submitted elsewhere?	No	
2. Has the work reported in this manuscript been reported in a manuscript previously rejected by the Journal of Business Ethics?	No	

**The Entrepreneurial Quest for Emancipation: Trade-Offs, Practices, and Outcomes in
an Indigenous Context**

(Short title: The Entrepreneurial Quest for Emancipation)

Albena Pergelova*
Associate Professor
Department of International Business, Marketing, Strategy & Law
School of Business, MacEwan University,
10700-104 Avenue, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, T5J 4S2
Tel. +1 780 633 3798
E-mail: PergelovaA@macewan.ca

Fernando Angulo-Ruiz
Associate Professor
Department of International Business, Marketing, Strategy & Law
School of Business, MacEwan University,
10700-104 Avenue, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, T5J 4S2
Tel. +1 780 633 3511
E-mail: Fernando.AnguloRuiz@macewan.ca

Leo-Paul Dana
Professor
Montpellier Business School & Montpellier Research in Management, Université de
Montpellier
2300, Avenue des Moulins
F-34185 Montpellier Cedex 4, France
Tel. +33 (0)4 67 10 28 18
E-mail: lp.dana@montpellier-bs.com

*Corresponding author

Declarations:

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

Acknowledgments: The authors are grateful to the Canadian Council for Aboriginal Business for providing access to the data set used in this study. The authors also acknowledge financial support from the Strategic Research Grant, MacEwan University. An early version of this article was presented at the Babson College Entrepreneurship Research Conference, and received the G. Dale Meyer Best Paper Award for the Most Relevant Research in Social Entrepreneurship. Comments and suggestions from conference participants are gratefully acknowledged.

1
2
3
4 **The Entrepreneurial Quest for Emancipation: Trade-Offs, Practices, and Outcomes in an**
5
6
7 **Indigenous Context**
8
9

10
11 **Abstract**
12

13
14 This paper builds on theoretical developments that view entrepreneurship as emancipation, i.e.,
15
16 entrepreneurial activities as generators of change and pursuit of freedom from perceived
17
18 constraints. Using a representative dataset of 1,095 SMEs owned by Indigenous entrepreneurs in
19
20 Canada, the authors investigate how pursuit of this freedom affects: (i) the way entrepreneurs
21
22 enact several aspects of their ventures; and (ii) the performance outcomes achieved. Findings
23
24 reveal how the initial motivations of entrepreneurs (seeking change for the social collective of
25
26 which they are a part vs. seeking autonomy for themselves) lead to distinct business practices,
27
28 which in turn impact differentially entrepreneurial outcomes.
29
30
31
32
33

34
35
36 *Keywords:* emancipation, seeking autonomy, authoring, declarations, economic outcomes, non-
37
38 economic outcomes
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1. Introduction

Scholars have been advancing critical perspectives about the role of entrepreneurship in society, the diverse motivations of entrepreneurs, and the urge to consider broader dimensions of value created by entrepreneurs, beyond economic outcomes (e.g., Dana and Light, 2011; Davies and Doherty, 2019; Goss et al., 2011; Hota et al., 2020; Imas et al., 2012; Tedmanson et al., 2015; Welter et al., 2017). Among frameworks used to guide empirical research is Rindova et al.'s (2009) view of entrepreneuring as emancipation, i.e., entrepreneurial activities as generators of change – broadly understood and not limited to economic outcomes – and as pursuit of liberation from perceived constraints. From this standpoint, entrepreneurs are agents of social change (Barth, 1963, 1967; Dana, 1995, pp. 62-63). The framework proposed by Rindova et al. (2009) has three main elements: (i) *seeking autonomy* (breaking away from authority and constraints - either for the entrepreneurs themselves or for the social collective of which they are a part); (ii) *authoring* (the design of new arrangements and relationships); and (iii) *making declarations* (engaging in discursive acts to create change).

So far, studies advancing the emancipation framework have primarily focused on specific groups of entrepreneurs. The literature largely examines the empowering potential of entrepreneurship for women in developing countries (e.g., Al-Dajani et al., 2015; Haugh and Talwar, 2016; McAdam et al., 2020; Sabella and El-Far, 2019) and the role of entrepreneurship as emancipatory work for stigmatized populations, such as former terrorists and sex workers (Chandra, 2017; Ruebottom and Toubiana, 2020). Jennings et al. (2016) depart from this focus, examining one of the elements of the emancipation framework (authoring) in mainstream businesses operating in a developed economy context. The emancipation framework, however, has been introduced as a broadly applicable perspective that challenges preconceived notions of

1
2
3
4 entrepreneurial motivations and legitimate outcomes, independent of an entrepreneur's
5
6 demographics or a country's level of economic development. There is a growing recognition in
7
8 the literature that many entrepreneurs start their venture pursuing goals different from and / or
9
10 going beyond economic gains (Dana, 1995, 2007; Jennings and Brush, 2013; McMullen and
11
12 Warnick, 2016). However, the norm in mainstream entrepreneurship literature is still to judge
13
14 entrepreneurial success by economic indicators, while other dimensions of value (and values)
15
16 remain underrepresented (Welter et al., 2017; Wiklund et al., 2019). By focusing heavily on
17
18 economic success, we as a scholarly community deprive ourselves of knowledge on the rich and
19
20 diverse motivations, practices, and outcomes that entrepreneurs pursue.
21
22
23
24

25
26 For a change-creation perspective on entrepreneurship to truly be able to find its place in
27
28 contemporary entrepreneurship discourse, we need both theoretical advancements and empirical
29
30 testing in diverse contexts. Against this backdrop, the research question upon which we focus in
31
32 this paper is that raised by Rindova et al. (2009, p. 481) regarding how entrepreneurs seeking
33
34 freedom for themselves differ from those seeking to enact change for the social collective: "*Do*
35
36 *entrepreneurs who view autonomy as freedom for themselves do things differently and achieve*
37
38 *different outcomes from those who view autonomy as freedom – and change – for the social*
39
40 *collectivity of which they are a part?"* While the intuitive answer is "yes", what is less clear is
41
42 *how*, via which mechanisms, entrepreneurs in the two groups (freedom for themselves, freedom
43
44 for the social collective) work towards their emancipation objectives. The answer to this question
45
46 is crucial to understanding emancipation in practice, as it addresses entrepreneurial motivations
47
48 (*seeking autonomy*), practices (*authoring* rules and arrangements, and *making declarations*), and
49
50 outcomes.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 In this research, we focus on entrepreneurs operating as a sole proprietorship, partnership,
5
6 or corporation that is incorporated under a federal or provincial charter in Canada. By focusing
7
8 on this group, we respond to calls to address the rich and diverse motivations and values that
9
10 drive entrepreneurs (Welter et al., 2017; Wiklund et al., 2019). Entrepreneurs could be looking
11
12 for freedom for themselves or seeking change for the community / social collective of which
13
14 they are a part; those looking to make change for a social collective can operate as for-profit, not-
15
16 for-profit or hybrid (combining social and economic mission) organizations, such as certified B-
17
18 Corps. In our case, entrepreneurs seeking change for the social collective incorporate social
19
20 goals, even if not explicitly / legally registered as an organization with a social mission.
21
22
23

24
25
26 We advance research on the emancipatory perspective in entrepreneurship in the
27
28 following ways. First, we contribute to better understanding the theoretical basis of the
29
30 emancipation framework by providing conceptual linkages among the different dimensions of
31
32 emancipation. Specifically, we complement the emancipation framework with literature on
33
34 entrepreneurial motivations and autonomy to provide the theoretical rationale for the
35
36 relationships among the emancipation dimensions. We focus on how the initial *seeking*
37
38 *autonomy* motivation will impact subsequent choices related to *authoring* and *making*
39
40 *declarations*, and how these in turn will influence businesses' economic and non-economic
41
42 outcomes. As such, we build on existing literature to develop a testable model that helps explain
43
44 the process of enacting emancipatory entrepreneurship, and the variety of outcomes achieved as
45
46 a result.
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 Second, we empirically test our model with a representative data set of indigenous-owned
54
55 SMEs in Canada. Indigenous people are descendants of those who inhabited a country or a
56
57 geographical region at the time when people of different cultures or ethnic origins arrived and
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 later became dominant through conquest, occupation, or settlement (Peredo et al., 2004; United
5
6 Nations, 2015). There are more than 476 million indigenous people worldwide (International
7
8 Labour Organization, 2019), and the history of colonization and acculturation has left many of
9
10 them in an economically disadvantaged position. In Canada, there are about 1,673,785 people
11
12 who identify themselves as an indigenous person (representing 4.9% of the total population in
13
14 Canada) (Statistics Canada, 2016). Of all indigenous people in Canada, 731,480 Indigenous
15
16 people live in urban areas, which accounts for 43.7% of the total indigenous population. Of
17
18 indigenous people living in urban areas, 51% are First Nations people, 45% Métis and 1% Inuit
19
20 (Anderson, 2019). Indigenous people in Canada are pursuing economic development with the
21
22 objectives of self-determination and economic self-sufficiency, and preservation of traditional
23
24 values while improving socio-economic circumstances for individuals, families, and
25
26 communities (Anderson et al., 2006). Indigenous entrepreneurship has been defined as the
27
28 creation, management and development of new ventures by indigenous people for the benefit of
29
30 indigenous people (Dana, 2007); the desired and achieved benefits of venturing can range from
31
32 the narrow view of economic profit for a single individual to the broad view of multiple, social
33
34 and economic advantages for entire communities (Hindle and Lansdowne, 2002, p. 2). Our
35
36 empirical context, therefore, is particularly fitting for exploring the emancipation perspective,
37
38 with its diversity of motivations and outcomes.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Overall, our study assesses the broader applicability of the emancipatory framework and
49
50 builds avenues for testable research that – while being mindful of context – also aims at
51
52 developing broader and deeper understanding of the emancipatory potential of entrepreneurship.
53
54 In what follows, we first introduce our theoretical framework, including the context, and develop
55
56 hypotheses building on Rindova et al.'s (2009) emancipation framework, complementing it with
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 literature on entrepreneurial motivation. Next, we introduce the method, data, and the way the
5
6 emancipation dimensions have been contextualized and operationalized. We then present the
7
8 results and conclude with a discussion of findings, as well as limitations and future research
9
10 directions.
11
12
13
14
15

16 **2. Theoretical framework and hypotheses**

17
18 Rindova et al. (2009) define entrepreneuring as “efforts to bring about new economic, social,
19
20 institutional, and cultural environments through the actions of an individual or group of
21
22 individuals” (p. 477). The broadened emphasis on newness (encompassing economic, social, and
23
24 related aspects) both resonates with economic definitions of entrepreneurship focused on
25
26 innovation (Schumpeter, 1934), and departs from them by escaping the default individualist
27
28 assumptions based on economics, and moving towards theorizing both the deeply individualist
29
30 (seeking autonomy from perceived constraints) and deeply social (and change-creating) aspects
31
32 of entrepreneuring (Rindova et al., 2009, p. 481).
33
34
35
36
37

38 The three core elements (seeking autonomy, authoring, and making declarations) of
39
40 Rindova et al.’s (2009) framework are as follows. The *seeking autonomy* aspect involves
41
42 breaking free from authority and breaking up of constraints – either for the entrepreneurs
43
44 themselves or for the social collective of which they are a part. It is defined as an entrepreneur’s
45
46 desire to break free from external authority; entrepreneurs could be looking for freedom for
47
48 themselves (e.g., independence, using creative potential, be their own boss, etc.), or freedom
49
50 (and change) for the social collective of which they are a part. In other words, seeking autonomy
51
52 is aspirational and involves moving to a desired state from a current one.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 The second aspect - *authoring* - refers to “defining relationships, arrangements, and rules
5
6 of engagement that preserve and potentially enhance the change potential of a given
7
8 entrepreneurial project” (Rindova et al., 2009, p. 483). This is the design of new arrangements
9
10 and relationships that support the entrepreneur’s intentions to change. Thus, authoring means
11
12 taking ownership of oneself (or one’s group) by redefining social arrangements (Chandra, 2017).
13
14 The third aspect – *making declarations*– is defined as discursive and rhetorical acts regarding the
15
16 actor’s intention to create change, and through this, seeking to alter “societal beliefs about the
17
18 very nature of things” (Rindova et al., 2009, p. 486) and use entrepreneurship to achieve progress
19
20 on his/her own terms.
21
22
23
24

25
26 Our research question, about how (via which mechanisms) entrepreneurs work towards
27
28 their emancipation objectives, is therefore a crucial one for understanding the emancipatory
29
30 potential of entrepreneurship. We approach this question by examining how the initial
31
32 motivation for *seeking autonomy* affects *authoring* and *making declarations*, and in turn how
33
34 these practices influence the *outcomes* achieved. Furthermore, it is recognized that the context
35
36 plays an important role for understanding emancipation in practice (Calas et al., 2009). The
37
38 answer to the question: “From what constrictive status quo do entrepreneurs seek emancipation?”
39
40 will be very different depending on context; e.g., entrepreneurs in economically underprivileged
41
42 contexts will face different constraints compared to the ones in economically well-developed
43
44 regions (Jennings et al., 2016). Therefore, in what follows, we first explain the context of this
45
46 study, and then proceed to develop the hypotheses.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 **2.1. Context**

56
57 The context for this paper is that of indigenous people in Canada, where legislation includes
58
59 three groups as legally indigenous: (i) First Nations; (ii) Inuit; and (iii) Métis, who are of mixed
60
61

1
2
3
4 ancestry. Dana (1995) showed that the motivations for and the entrepreneurship practices of
5
6 Alaska Natives were very different than those of non-indigenous people accustomed to a
7
8 different context. Comparing indigenous and non-indigenous entrepreneurs in Canada, Dana
9
10 (1996) revealed similar findings. This can be explained by unique cultural capital that shaped
11
12 values of each ethno-cultural group. For countless generations, indigenous people in Canada
13
14 were able to feed their families and live a good life as they perceived it, by harvesting
15
16 sustainably and caring for their environment as prescribed by the teachings of the elders who
17
18 discouraged waste. In the pre-colonial context marked by the absence of governmental welfare
19
20 programs, insurance for the future was acquired by avoiding any abuse of natural resources.
21
22 People learned it was right to fish for the day and feed members of the community, but cultural
23
24 capital taught that nobody had the right to kill excessively and hoard. Among indigenous
25
26 peoples, neither land nor seas were owned by anyone. Resources were available for fair use by
27
28 all, but not for abuse.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Before the introduction of capitalism, indigenous peoples fully understood the concept of
37
38 stakeholder – but they were unfamiliar with the notion of stockholder. In their traditional context,
39
40 there was a return on sustainable behaviors, rather than a return on investment. Irresponsible
41
42 conduct could have serious implications on future generations. In contrast, the context of non-
43
44 indigenous settlers allowed those settlers to have the mindset that it was fine to maximize return
45
46 on investment in the short-run. Ignoring environmental impact, their enterprises obtained a
47
48 competitive advantage in the global economy. Today, both groups seek success in the global
49
50 economy, but it is understandable that indigenous peoples prefer to participate “in the global
51
52 economy on their own terms” (Anderson, Dana and Dana, 2006, p. 48). Even before the creation
53
54 of Canada, cultural capital taught indigenous Canadians the importance of acting sustainably; it
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 is therefore no wonder that many indigenous people are motivated to be entrepreneurs with a
5
6 goal of social betterment and not simply profit-maximization.
7
8

9 Indigenous people in Canada are accepting of development, as long as it does not harm
10 stakeholders. In Baffin Island, for example, the Baffinland Iron Mines Corporation has been
11 mining iron ore since 2015. All was fine as long as the mine had minimal impact on the
12 environment. In February 2021, a group of hunters decided while they were fine with existing
13 operations, they deemed unethical that the corporation announced that it “needed” to expand.
14 The hunters then blockaded Mary River iron ore mine. Their argument was that they were
15 thinking about younger generations, for whom they wanted a clean environment and healthy
16 food; their cultural capital taught them that healthy food for the future was everyone’s
17 responsibility and that this should not be compromised for short-term economic gain (CBC news,
18 2021).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 Context is essential for understanding entrepreneurship by both providing individuals
34 with opportunities and setting boundaries for individual actions; thus, individuals may
35 experience the context as an asset or a liability (Welter, 2011). The majority of indigenous
36 populations are characterized by relative economic deprivation (Peredo et al., 2004; Peredo and
37 Chrisman, 2006). From this perspective, one might perceive the indigenous context as a liability.
38 However, the indigenous context provides entrepreneurs with culture-specific values and skills
39 (Dana, 2015; Hindle & Moroz, 2010) that can be leveraged in the marketplace to bring about
40 social and economic change.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 The Canadian approach to indigenous entrepreneurship has been centered on seeking to
54 end dependency through economic self-sufficiency, i.e., the emphasis has been on creating
55 businesses that can participate successfully in the global economy, while at the same time
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 preserving cultural traditions and improving socio-economic circumstances for indigenous
5
6 communities (Anderson et al., 2006; Peredo et al., 2004). The indigenous context offers a fertile
7
8 ground to examine the question of entrepreneurship as a change - creating activity (Calas et al.,
9
10 2009) aiming at achieving a variety of outcomes, not limited only to economic ones. We now
11
12 proceed to develop the hypotheses of our study with a focus on how *seeking autonomy* affects
13
14 *authoring* and *making declarations*, and through them the *outcomes* entrepreneurs achieve.
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 **2.2. Seeking autonomy and authoring**

22
23 The limited entrepreneurship research on emancipation that takes as a theoretical departure the
24
25 work of Rindova et al. (2009) has examined *authoring* practices (i.e., ways of organizing that
26
27 depart from the status quo) that relate to work-life balance, e.g., reducing the number of hours
28
29 worked, putting limits on business-related activities, and minimizing work-to-family interference
30
31 (Jennings et al., 2016). While Jennings et al. (2016) do not provide a theoretical distinction
32
33 between entrepreneurs looking for freedom for themselves vs. those looking for freedom for the
34
35 social collective, their arguments are based on an assumption that – in the context of developed
36
37 economies – constrictive corporate practices constitute a major constraint from which
38
39 entrepreneurs try to escape. Such practices either do not allow entrepreneurs to easily achieve
40
41 work-life balance or limit their individual freedom in some other ways (e.g., reducing their
42
43 creative expression and / or feelings of independence). In this line of theorizing, entrepreneurs
44
45 seeking freedom for themselves would be likely to enact *authoring* practices that enhance the
46
47 potential for individual freedom, for instance, setting their work routines and schedules to
48
49 accommodate family priorities or using their ventures as a vehicle to enhance control over the
50
51 direction of their careers and life. Similar accounts are reported in the literature on
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 entrepreneurial autonomy where some of the major entrepreneurial drivers have been found to be
5
6 decisional freedom, regulating their own time, self-expression, being in charge, and working
7
8 according to their own goals and values (Van Gelderen, 2016; Van Gelderen and Jansen, 2006).
9

10
11 In contrast to entrepreneurial practices looking to achieve individual freedom, accounts of
12
13 entrepreneurship as a broader change-creating activity (i.e., aiming to affect change for the social
14
15 collective), unravel authoring practices that challenge preconceived cultural and/or industry
16
17 norms and are usually concerned with a wider range of value created. For instance, Haugh and
18
19 Talwar (2016) discuss authoring practices in the form of flexible business models that build
20
21 subtle avenues for social change while preserving some cultural traditions. In Haugh and
22
23 Talwar’s research context of a rural women enterprise where women are looking to “break free”
24
25 from cultural norms that constrain their ability to do paid work, the innovative authoring
26
27 arrangements seem to allow for both individual feelings of empowerment (from access to income
28
29 and increased confidence), and social and political empowerment (from increasing the women’s
30
31 status in the community and their participation in public life). Similar accounts of emancipation
32
33 practices are reported in other studies that focus on women empowerment in developing
34
35 countries through entrepreneurship (e.g., Datta and Gailey, 2012; Scott et al., 2012).
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Through *authoring* different practices, structures and relationship engagements,
44
45 entrepreneurship creates and/or amplifies cracks in rigid social and economic relationships that
46
47 have imposed constraints on entrepreneurs or other members of their social surroundings
48
49 (Rindova et al., 2009). However, entrepreneurs’ initial motivations for venturing will have an
50
51 effect on the kinds of structures and relationships that are being built, in order to support the
52
53 change-creation potential of the venture. Such a view is supported by research on entrepreneurial
54
55 motivations, where motivation is an important explanatory mechanism for entrepreneurial
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 aspirations and behaviors (e.g., Carsrud and Brännback, 2011; Dana, 1997; Hessels et al., 2008).
5
6 Thus, if entrepreneurs are initially motivated by a personal wish to break away, dedicating
7
8 attention to communal objectives might be challenging; however, when the initial motivation has
9
10 been on freeing and changing the status quo for others (e.g., Chandra, 2017; Dorado and
11
12 Ventresca, 2013), an entrepreneur might forgo authoring practices related to individual freedom
13
14 (e.g., personal flexibility and control) in order to accommodate communal objectives. The
15
16 balance between individual freedom and communal objectives can be partially explained by
17
18 cultural capital (Light and Dana, 2013); transmitted between generations, cultural capital shapes
19
20 prevalent values including cultural notions about what is right or wrong. In a fishing community
21
22 with two ethno-cultural groups, Light and Dana (2013) found that while local indigenous
23
24 respondents felt it was fine to harvest the fish they needed for subsistence, only people with
25
26 external cultural capital were willing to have enterprises to fish a surplus to be sold commercially
27
28 to consumers outside the community.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 In the context of our study, focusing on indigenous entrepreneurs in Canada, it is
37
38 recognized that indigenous people want to rebuild their communities and participate in the
39
40 economy on their own terms with a degree of self-determination (Anderson et al., 2006). Dana
41
42 (2007) defines indigenous entrepreneurship as “self-employment based on indigenous
43
44 knowledge” (p. 5), where indigenous knowledge is “the way of living within contexts of flux,
45
46 paradox, and tension, respecting the pull of dualism and reconciling opposing forces” (Battiste
47
48 and Henderson, 2000, p. 42). More specifically, indigenous entrepreneurship can aim for a broad
49
50 variety of outcomes on a continuum from economic profit for a single individual to social and
51
52 economic progress for entire communities (Hindle and Lansdowne, 2002). Thus, it is important
53
54 to recognize that even though indigenous entrepreneurship is often considered as a form of
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 collective / community-focused endeavor (Peredo et al., 2004; Peredo and McLean, 2013),
5
6 indigenous entrepreneurship can encompass a broad spectrum of venturing motivations
7
8 (including seeking freedom for myself or seeking freedom for the social collective), which can
9
10 manifest itself in diverse authoring practices. Specifically, following the preceding discussion,
11
12 we expect that there will be a trade-off between authoring personal change practices (e.g.,
13
14 individual flexibility and control) and authoring practices that include broader social value,
15
16 depending on the initial motivation for *seeking autonomy*. Formally:
17
18
19
20

21 *H1: There is a trade-off between authoring practices such that (a) entrepreneurs seeking*
22
23 *freedom for the social collectivity will be less likely to enact practices that allow for individual*
24
25 *flexibility and control (authoring personal change); while (b) entrepreneurs seeking freedom for*
26
27 *themselves will be less likely to enact authoring practices that address social change.*
28
29
30
31
32

33 **2.3. Seeking autonomy and making declarations**

34
35 A crucial aspect of Rindova et al.'s (2009) emancipation framework is the concept of *making*
36
37 *declarations*, i.e., engaging in discursive acts that affirm the entrepreneur's intention to create
38
39 change. Communicative action thus becomes central to emancipation (Chandra, 2017). As such,
40
41 speech is an important part of the change-creation process (Dey and Mason, 2018; Ruebottom,
42
43 2013).
44
45
46
47

48 Strategic narratives as legitimation activities have long been recognized in the
49
50 entrepreneurship literature, as they establish patterns of meaning and position the entrepreneurs
51
52 in their environment (Martens et al., 2007). This strand of research has typically focused on how
53
54 entrepreneurs influence stakeholders' beliefs in a venture's legitimacy, therefore affecting the
55
56 venture's access to resources and survival / growth prospects. In contrast to this body of
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 research, the emancipation perspective acknowledges that instead of merely seeking to position
5 themselves within established institutions to gain legitimacy, entrepreneurs might need to openly
6 expose contradictions and differences in order to gain stakeholders' support for an intended
7 change. As Rindova et al. (2009) explain, "in contrast to much current research on new venture
8 legitimization that takes existing institutions as given and as a resource to be used to increase
9 legitimacy, an emancipatory perspective suggests the need to attend to the institutional work that
10 accompanies entrepreneuring activities" (p. 487). Creating "cracks" and exposing contradictions
11 in prevailing institutional arrangements, however, is a formidable task for entrepreneurs. This
12 task is made more complex by the need to balance the desire to affect a change and the
13 accompanying rhetoric through which entrepreneurs position themselves, with the limitations
14 imposed by existing institutions (O'Neil and Ucbasaran, 2016).
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 To explain how entrepreneurs seeking freedom for themselves differ from entrepreneurs
32 seeking to affect change for the social collective with respect to *making declarations*, we build
33 on research proposing that motivations are an essential component of the legitimation process.
34 Motivation leads to specific individual actions (Drori and Honig, 2013; O'Neil and Ucbasaran,
35 2016), as well as to decisions about the structures and activities entrepreneurs will create.
36 Motivation, thus, will determine the extent to which entrepreneurs will choose to engage in
37 discursive acts challenging existing beliefs and/or institutional arrangements. Due to the high
38 level of obstacles entrepreneurs confront when trying to "dream a brave new world" (Rindova et
39 al., 2009), we expect that entrepreneurs seeking to affect a change for the social collective will
40 be innately more motivated to engage in *making declarations*; indeed, they must do so if they are
41 to "stand out" and "break free". The literature has provided examples of how entrepreneurs
42 seeking for individual freedom (e.g., creative expression, control over working hours, etc.) can
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 achieve their dreams within the constraints of typical industry arrangements through *authoring*
5
6 innovative practices (Jennings et al., 2016). However, those entrepreneurs looking to alter
7
8 “societal beliefs about the very nature of things” (Rindova et al., 2009, p. 486) need to mobilize
9
10 broader stakeholder support, and consequently will be more likely to declare their change-
11
12 creating intent. Therefore, we expect:
13
14

15
16 *H2a: Entrepreneurs seeking freedom for the social collectivity will be more likely to engage*
17
18 *in making declarations than entrepreneurs seeking freedom for themselves.*
19
20

21
22 Furthermore, we expect that social context will be an important factor that will shape the
23
24 willingness to engage in making declarations. According to Statistics Canada (2016) more than
25
26 half of indigenous people in Canada live “on reserve.” Entrepreneurs in our context can live and
27
28 operate either from “on reserve” – where they are placed in a context supportive of their social
29
30 identity as an indigenous person (entrepreneur), or “off reserve.” While there are many
31
32 differences among the different groups of indigenous people, one common aspect is their shared
33
34 deep connection to the Land (Anderson et al., 2006; Lalonde et al., 2016; Peredo et al., 2004;
35
36 Peredo and McLean, 2013). The connection to the Land is understood as more than just
37
38 geographic proximity (i.e., living on traditional land /reserve further away from urbanization), to
39
40 encompass beliefs about the interconnection between all things in nature – spirits, animals,
41
42 humans. It has been suggested that the conception of Land plays a central role in indigenous
43
44 identity and is an important anchor for constructive social change and maintenance of positive
45
46 social identity (Lalonde et al., 2016). In the same vein, people residing on reserve have a
47
48 different identity than those “off reserve.” On a reserve, people socialize with like-minded
49
50 people and it is relatively easier to preserve cultural traditions such as living off the land, for
51
52 example harvesting wild rice.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 To understand how social context may impact entrepreneurs' willingness to engage in
5
6 making declarations, we borrow from identity theories (Stets and Burke, 2000; Stryker, 1980;
7
8 Tajfel and Turner, 1979). Entrepreneurship is an inherently social activity, and the entrepreneur's
9
10 sense of self and social identity will impact entrepreneurial choices and decisions (Fauchart and
11
12 Gruber, 2011). Peoples' identities are based on self-views emerging from membership in
13
14 particular groups or roles (Stets and Burke, 2000). In particular, social identity theory (Tajfel and
15
16 Turner, 1979) is useful in understanding identity as it relates to an individual's social
17
18 relationships and membership in groups or social categories. People are usually embedded in
19
20 multiple role relationships and hold multiple identities (Stryker and Burke, 2000). Identity
21
22 theorists have identified the notion of salience (Stryker, 1980; Stryker and Serpe, 1994) as
23
24 important to understanding people's identity enactment. Salience refers to the readiness to act out
25
26 a focal identity (Murnieks et al., 2014). Depending on the social context, one's social identity
27
28 may be more or less salient. Different situations contextually activate different behaviors
29
30 (Stryker and Burke, 2000). We expect that entrepreneurs placed in their social context on reserve
31
32 (living on traditional land) will be more likely to exhibit high indigenous identity salience and
33
34 engage in making declarations about their desire to "break free" as an expression of their
35
36 position as an indigenous entrepreneur. Identity theory postulates that the higher the salience of
37
38 an identity, the greater the probability of behavioral choices in line with expectations related to
39
40 that identity (Stryker and Burke, 2000). In addition, entrepreneurs living and operating from a
41
42 reserve are likely to have higher commitment to an identity, defined as the number of persons to
43
44 whom one is tied through an identity and the relative strength of the ties (Stets and Burke, 2000).
45
46 This commitment increases the salience of an indigenous identity and the probability that
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 entrepreneurs will act on this identity by engaging in a discourse that affirms emancipatory
5
6 entrepreneurial work. Thus, we propose:

7
8
9 *H2b: Social context (being on reserve) will positively moderate the relationship between*
10
11 *seeking autonomy and making declarations.*
12
13
14

15 16 **2.4.How seeking autonomy affects performance outcomes: the mediating role of authoring** 17 18 **and making declarations** 19 20

21 Literature recognizes that the initial motivation and impetus of the entrepreneur will drive
22
23 strategic decisions and actions that will subsequently impact the organization's performance;
24
25 scholars have examined, for instance, how values and motivations impact organizational
26
27 structure and trajectory in the context of pro-social organizing and hybrid ventures (e.g.,
28
29 Battilana and Lee, 2014; Davies and Doherty, 2019; Siqueira et al., 2018). Such a perspective
30
31 aligns with Rindova et al.'s (2009) view that an emancipatory perspective should pay greater
32
33 attention to how entrepreneurs - as Barthian (1963; 1967) agents of change - imprint their
34
35 creative visions on the reality that surrounds them. The conventional notion of "traditional"
36
37 entrepreneurship vs. social entrepreneurship assumes that individuals starting a venture with a
38
39 concern primarily for themselves will pursue economic objectives, while those starting a venture
40
41 with the objective to help others will focus on social outcomes (Fauchart and Gruber, 2011;
42
43 McMullen and Warnick, 2016; Peredo and McLean, 2013).
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 Within the context of entrepreneurship as emancipation, however, individuals who are
52
53 looking for freedom for themselves may not necessarily have the objective of high economic
54
55 performance; rather, they may start a business with the goal of attaining a better work-life
56
57 balance for example (Eddleston and Powell, 2012; Jennings et al., 2016, Jennings and Brush,
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 2013), or having a greater freedom in expressing their creative potential and the autonomy to
5
6 decide what to do (Van Gelderen, 2016). Such motivations may lead to very different authoring
7
8 practices, and consequently different performance outcomes. Entrepreneurs looking for a better
9
10 work-life balance may set their schedules in a way that accommodates personal/family priorities
11
12 (Jennings and McDougald, 2007), thus potentially forgoing some business opportunities (and
13
14 achieving lower financial performance, while preserving their autonomy). The entrepreneurship
15
16 literature has provided many examples of authoring practices that depart from the status quo in
17
18 an attempt to accommodate different life priorities, such as scaling back commitments in the
19
20 business domain, and turning down opportunities for free publicity in order to keep the business
21
22 size manageable (Jennings et al., 2016). Indeed, the autonomy motive for venturing into
23
24 entrepreneurship has been found to oftentimes limit growth (Van Gelderen, 2016).
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 On the other hand, entrepreneurs looking for control over their work and expressing their
32
33 creative potential may put more emphasis on innovating new products and / or processes (Birley
34
35 and Westhead, 1994; Carter et al., 2003), thus potentially reaching very different outcomes
36
37 compared to their counterparts who -while also looking for freedom for themselves- have chosen
38
39 authoring practices that accommodate other life priorities. The types of outcomes achieved by
40
41 entrepreneurs are thus not simply a function of their initial motivation (freedom for myself or
42
43 freedom for the social collective), but rather the way in which entrepreneurs enact their vision for
44
45 (individual) freedom through different authoring practices. Entrepreneurs seeking freedom for
46
47 themselves to achieve better work-life balance will likely enact different practices from the
48
49 entrepreneur who starts a business with the objective of having the decisional freedom and
50
51 control over creative aspects of the business that will allow them to launch new products on the
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 market. Both groups are motivated by autonomy and “freedom for themselves”, but the
5
6 difference in authoring practices will lead to different outcomes.
7
8

9 Furthermore, the making declarations aspect of emancipation can also impact the
10 outcomes of the entrepreneurial project. Choosing to engage in a rhetoric that asserts the
11 entrepreneurs’ desire for change will act as a catalyst for actions and will increase the
12 entrepreneurs’ commitment to the goals espoused by the rhetoric (O’Neil and Ucbasaran, 2016;
13 Rindova et al., 2009). In our context of indigenous entrepreneurs, engaging in discursive acts that
14 express the indigenous peoples’ desire for self-determination and economic self-sufficiency is
15 crucial (Peredo et al., 2004; Peredo and McLean, 2013). Indigenous entrepreneurship has been
16 suggested as an important path for the creation of an enterprise culture that simultaneously
17 respects indigenous traditions and empowers indigenous people as economic agents (Hindle and
18 Lansdowne, 2002; Hindle and Moroz, 2010). As such, a rhetoric legitimizing indigenous
19 entrepreneurship can serve as an important link between the initial seeking freedom motivation
20 and the outcomes achieved. Scholars in entrepreneurial legitimation and discourse have
21 suggested the use of identity theories as helpful in understanding the legitimation work involved
22 in *making declarations* (O’Neil and Ucbasaran, 2016). We surmise that engaging in discursive
23 acts to assert an indigenous entrepreneurship legitimation will result in increased indigenous
24 identity salience and commitment, and thus will lead to actions and outcomes consistent with
25 such identity (Stryker and Burke, 2000). Thus, even if the entrepreneurs were initially motivated
26 to seek freedom for themselves, engaging in a rhetoric that asserts their identity as an indigenous
27 entrepreneur (which is an act of emancipation) may lead them to prioritize practices that will
28 help achieve social outcomes beneficial for the (indigenous) community. We therefore expect
29 that the relationship between seeking freedom for themselves (vs. for the social collective) and
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 outcomes achieved is not straightforward but is mediated by the enactment of different practices.

5
6 Formally:

7
8
9 *H3: Authoring and making declaration practices will mediate the relationship between*
10
11 *the initial seeking freedom motivation and the outcomes achieved.*
12

13
14 Figure 1 summarizes our conceptual model and visualizes the hypothesized relationships
15
16 among variables.

17
18
19 [Insert Figure 1 here]
20
21
22

23 **3. Method**

24 **3.1. Sample and Data**

25
26 In this research, we employ data built by the Canadian Council for Aboriginal Business (CCAB).

27
28 The data includes a representative sample of 1,095 indigenous business owners. CCAB
29
30 developed the 2010 Aboriginal Business Survey (ABS) to contribute to the understanding of the
31
32 opportunities and challenges faced by privately owned indigenous businesses in Canada, their
33
34 aspirations, goals and strategies, and the key factors that contribute to growth (Canadian Council
35
36 for Aboriginal Business, 2010, p. 1). The authors were given access to the data files through a
37
38 partnership between the authors' university and CCAB, including a memorandum of
39
40 understanding, and ongoing research collaboration and knowledge dissemination events¹.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 The ABS is based on a telephone survey conducted with a sample of self-identified First
49
50 Nations, Métis and Inuit, who own a private small business (not owned by the community). A
51
52 small business in this setting is defined as that with 100 employees or less and owned 51% or
53
54 more by indigenous entrepreneurs. CCAB was responsible to develop the sampling frame.
55
56
57
58

59
60

¹ We are deeply grateful to the CCAB for providing access to the dataset.
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 CCAB identified lists for contact information for indigenous businesses. To identify potential
5
6 respondents, CCAB also included notices on its website, other indigenous websites, press
7
8 releases, and networking with a range of organizations to locate respondents. CCAB also set up a
9
10 1-800 number as well as a referral approach to boost the sample (Canadian Council for
11
12 Aboriginal Business, 2010, p. 45).
13

14
15
16 The ABS questionnaire was designed using Statistics Canada's 2002 Aboriginal
17
18 Entrepreneur Survey as a guideline (as well as input from the 1996 and 1997 Aboriginal
19
20 Business Surveys from Industry Canada). Environics Research Group developed an initial
21
22 content outline and additional drafts. Input on the questionnaire design was solicited from the
23
24 ABS Research Advisory Board and study supporters. The questionnaire was pre-tested with a
25
26 small sample of participants, conducted in the same manner as for the full survey. Minor
27
28 questionnaire changes were implemented following feedback from the pre-test (Canadian
29
30 Council for Aboriginal Business, 2010, p. 46).
31
32
33

34
35
36 Data collection was conducted from September 10 to November 19, 2010 by Environics
37
38 Research Group, one of Canada's leading public opinion research firms. Fieldwork was
39
40 conducted at Environics' central facilities in Toronto where field supervisors were present at all
41
42 times to ensure accurate interviewing and recording of responses. During fieldwork, 10 percent
43
44 of each interviewer's work was unobtrusively monitored for quality control. All interviews were
45
46 conducted in English and the average interview length was 22 minutes. Five calls or more were
47
48 made to each business selected into the sample before classifying it as a "no answer."
49
50

51
52
53 Importantly, the survey was conducted in accordance with the standards set out by the Marketing
54
55 Research and Intelligence Association and applicable federal legislation (Personal Information
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Protection and Electronic Documents Act), and was registered with the Canadian Survey
5
6 Research Council (Canadian Council for Aboriginal Business, 2010, p. 46).
7
8

9 CCAB reports that the effective response rate for the survey was 30 percent. For more
10 details on the call disposition and the calculation of response rate, please check Canadian
11 Council for Aboriginal Business (2010, p. 47). The data set provides demographic information,
12
13 insights into corporate governance, markets, competitive advantage and size of business, and
14
15 business performance, use of private capital and government programs and indigenous business
16
17 owners' perceptions of federal government procurement strategy for indigenous business
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

66 The 2010 ABS data set provides key information to answer our research question on how
67 entrepreneurs seeking freedom for themselves and those seeking freedom for the social collective
68 work towards their emancipation objectives. In particular, the ABS provides data to test our
69 hypotheses related to the interconnections among seeking autonomy, authoring, making
70 declarations, and economic and non-economic outcomes. Based on ABS data, these hypotheses
71 are tested in the context of self-identified indigenous entrepreneurs, owners of small businesses,
72 which at the same time are private enterprises (not owned by the community or the reserve
73 band).
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100

101 **3.2. Measures**

102 Since we examine the influence of seeking autonomy on business outcomes through the
103 mediation of authoring and making declarations, we have three sets of variables: dependent
104 variables, mediating variables, and independent variables.
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165

166 ² For a more detailed information about the ABS methodology, please refer to Canadian Council for Aboriginal
167 Business (2010).
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 **3.2.1. Dependent variables**
8

9 Dependent variables include business outcomes. We operationalize business *outcomes* with
10 different economic and non-economic indicators taken from the ABS survey.
11

12
13 **Revenue growth.** To measure revenue growth, we use ABS question: “between 2009 and 2010,
14 have your business’s gross sales revenues?”. This question included 3 possible answers: (0)
15 decreased, (1) stay the same, (2) increased.
16
17

18
19 **Success.** We measure success using ABS question: “Based on your own personal objectives for
20 your business, how successful do you feel your business has been to date?” A 5-point scale was
21 used: (1) not at all successful, (2) not very successful, (3) somewhat successful, (4) very
22 successful, and (5) extremely successful.
23
24

25
26 **Product innovation.** We used ABS question: “in the past three years, did your business introduce
27 any new products or services?”: (0) no, and (1) yes.
28
29

30
31 **Process innovation.** We used ABS question: “in the past three years, did your business introduce
32 any new processes?”: (0) no, and (1) yes.
33
34

35
36 **Training employees.** We used ABS question “did your business support or provide training or
37 education for its employees in the past year?”: (0) no, and (1) yes.
38
39

40
41 **Percentage indigenous employees.** For each business in the data set, we divided the total number
42 of current indigenous employees by the total number of current employees. Increasing the rates
43 of employment and training of indigenous people is considered a major objective by many
44 indigenous entrepreneurs, and as such represents a social goal resonating with our empirical
45 context.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

3.2.2. Mediating variables

We measure five mediating variables. Four of these are indicators of *authoring* practices and the remaining one reflects *making declarations*.

3.2.2.1. Authoring

Following Jennings et al. (2016) and earlier literature on emancipation, *authoring* is measured with attention to practices that depart from the status quo in a conventional corporate life and give the entrepreneurs the opportunity to do things in their own way. We include both authoring personal change and authoring social change.

Authoring personal change. For authoring personal change, we operationalize two variables: (i) set own schedule; and (ii) control destiny.

Set own schedule is based on the following multiple response open-ended question included in the ABS questionnaire: “What would you say are the greatest advantages or benefits of being a small business owner?”. In particular, we focused on answers for the category ‘set own schedule / hours’. There were 247 respondents who choose this category. However, we discounted the number of respondents who at the same time indicated that ‘working long hours/ time off is limited’ is a greatest disadvantage or challenge of being a small business owner.

Therefore, the measure of setting own schedule is a binary variable that indicates as “1” an entrepreneur who set his/her own working time and “0” otherwise. This measure is comparable to the one used by Jennings et al. (2016): “work less than 40 hours a week”. Arguably, there is correspondence between setting own schedules and working less hours.

Control destiny is also elaborated from the question, “What would you say are the greatest advantages or benefits of being a small business owner?”. We focus, in particular, on

1
2
3
4 response categories: (1) control my own destiny/ life/ career; and (2) freedom/ do what I want.

5
6 These categories were converted into binary variables. The final measure of control destiny is a
7
8
9 binary variable where 1 indicates the respondents who chose at least one category of the two
10
11 previously indicated, and 0 otherwise.

12
13
14 **Authoring social change.** To operationalize authoring social change, we built on research
15
16 examining new business models departing from the status quo as an indicator of authoring (e.g.,
17
18 Haugh and Talwar, 2016). In our case, the entrepreneurs embrace a business model where social
19
20 objectives are given high importance (Peredo et al., 2004; Peredo and McLean, 2013). Authoring
21
22 social change includes two variables as follows.

23
24
25
26 *Community employment.* This variable measures the importance of community
27
28 employment as a business objective. The ABS question asked to rate the importance of
29
30 community employment for the business over the coming year. The scale used range from 1 =
31
32 not important at all to 5 = very important.

33
34
35
36 *Community service.* The second variable measures the importance of community service
37
38 as a business objective. Similar to community employment, a 5-point scale was used: 1 = not
39
40 important at all to 5 = very important.

41 42 43 44 45 **3.2.2.2. Making declarations**

46
47 To operationalize *making declarations*, we aligned ourselves with Rindova et al.'s (2009)
48
49 concept that the entrepreneur's intention to create change should be ingrained in discursive or
50
51 rhetorical actions. To contextualize this concept, we used the ABS question, "What do you
52
53 regard as your competitive advantage in your industry?" and focused on the response category
54
55 'identified as an aboriginal business'. We use a binary variable where 1 represents those
56
57 entrepreneurs who clearly identified as an indigenous business in their dealings with different
58
59
60
61

1
2
3
4 stakeholders. Our logic is as follows. Being indigenous businessperson who explicitly identifies
5
6 as such can be a challenging task; in fact, there are stereotypes cast on indigenous people that can
7
8 exclude them from business prospects. A telling example from our own qualitative research with
9
10 indigenous people is when one participant (who *is* indigenous, but *not visibly so*) explained how
11
12 after being identified as indigenous he was told “we are sorry, but we were looking for someone
13
14 professional to do this job”. Therefore, identifying oneself as indigenous can be considered a
15
16 discourse / rhetoric regarding the actor’s intention to create change, “altering societal beliefs
17
18 about the very nature of things” (Rindova et al., 2009, p. 486).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 **3.2.3. Independent variables**

27
28 Our main independent variable is *seeking autonomy*. We measure this variable with reference to
29
30 the entrepreneur’s main reasons for starting a business which are in line with the “breaking free
31
32 from constraints” theorizing of Rindova et al. (2009). These authors propose two components for
33
34 seeking autonomy: freedom for themselves and freedom for the social collectivity. In our present
35
36 study, both components have been operationalized using responses to an open multiple response
37
38 question in the ABS questionnaire. The question posed was, “What is the main reason why you
39
40 decided to start your own business?” There were 15 categories of responses. Respondents chose
41
42 a maximum of four. We focus on responses given to the first two selected options (whatever the
43
44 categories are) because of the great majority of responses provided (95.3% of responses).
45
46
47
48
49

50 *Freedom for themselves.* To measure freedom for themselves, we focus on the following
51
52 response categories: (1) to be my own boss / entrepreneurial vision; (2) independence / freedom /
53
54 creative control; (3) enjoy my job / use of skills / nature of my work; (4) better / more support for
55
56 family / have more time / stay home; and (5) dislike / tired of working for others / previous job.
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Each of these categories was recoded into a binary variable. We then summed up all five binary
5
6 variables to create an initial *freedom for themselves* measure. This new variable has 0 as
7
8 minimum value (which includes 51.3% of responses) and 2 as maximum value (5.4% of
9
10 responses). Given that the percentage of responses for value 2 is very low, we created a binary
11
12 variable that merges responses to values 1 and 2 into a new category coded as 1 and 0 otherwise.
13
14 Therefore, the final measure of freedom for themselves used in the study is a binary variable that
15
16 equals 1 if the respondents chose at least 1 category of the five previously indicated.
17
18
19
20

21 ***Freedom for the social collectivity.*** To operationalize freedom for the social collectivity
22
23 we center on the following categories: (1) help people / give back to community / First Nations,
24
25 and (2) create employment for others / indigenous communities. We followed a similar
26
27 procedure as for the freedom for themselves variable. Each of these two categories was recoded
28
29 into a binary variable. We then summed up the two binary variables to create the measure for
30
31 freedom for the social collectivity. This new variable has 0 as minimum value (which includes
32
33 90% of responses) and 2 as maximum value (0.3% of responses). Given that the percentage of
34
35 responses for value 2 is extremely low, we created a binary variable that merges responses to
36
37 values 1 and 2 into a new category coded as 1 and 0 otherwise. Thus, the measure of freedom for
38
39 the social collectivity equals 1 if the respondents chose at least one category of the two
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

3.2.4. Moderating variable

Location. We used the question, ‘Is this business located on a reserve or not?’ (0) no, and (1)
yes. It is important to include this variable since the entrepreneurial activities of indigenous
people in their indigenous setting (reserve) are situated in communities of indigenous people

1
2
3
4 with shared social, economic and cultural patterns (Peredo et al., 2004). The characteristics of
5
6 entrepreneurship among indigenous people who migrate individually or in relatively small
7
8 groups, especially to urban areas, may well be different and it has been suggested that they may
9
10 more closely resemble that of ethnic enclaves (Peredo et al., 2004).
11
12
13
14

15 16 **3.2.5. Control variables** 17

18 We used a number of control variables, typically employed in empirical research in
19
20 entrepreneurship.
21

22
23 **Gender.** We used a binary variable, where 0 equals male entrepreneurs and 1 equals female
24
25 entrepreneurs.
26

27
28 **Age.** We used the age of the entrepreneur in years.
29

30
31 **Education.** We used business training as critical variable to capture the education of the
32
33 entrepreneur. In particular we used question ‘did you take any business training courses at the
34
35 college or university level?’ (0) no, and (1) yes.
36
37

38
39 **Firm age.** We used the firm age since inception in years.
40

41
42 **Firm size.** We used the total number of current employees.
43

44
45 **Industry.** We considered 10 sectors: (1) agriculture, forestry, fishing & hunting, mining and oil
46
47 & gas extraction; utilities; (2) construction; (3) manufacturing; (4) wholesale trade, retail trade,
48
49 and transportation and warehousing; (5) information and cultural industries (e.g., broadcasting,
50
51 internet, publishing); (6) finance & insurance, and real estate and rental & leasing; (7)
52
53 professional, scientific and technical services (e.g., accounting, advertising, legal), management
54
55 of companies & enterprises, administration & support, waste management and remediation
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 services; (8) educational services, and health care and social assistance; (9) arts, entertainment &
5
6 recreation, and accommodation & food services; and (10) other services.
7
8
9

10 11 **3.3.Analytical procedures** 12

13 Our analytical approach includes mediation analysis, and we follow Hayes's (2013) procedures.
14

15
16 First, in Models 1 to 4 (Table 3), we analyze the relationship between seeking autonomy
17
18 (freedom for themselves and for the social collectivity) and authoring, and in Model 5 we assess
19
20 the relationship between seeking autonomy and making declarations. Second, in Models 6 to 11
21
22 (Table 4), we test the relationship between *seeking autonomy* and multiple economic and non-
23
24 economic outcomes (revenue growth, success, product innovation, process innovation, training
25
26 employees, and percentage of indigenous employees). In order to avoid a false dichotomy
27
28 evaluation between seeking freedom for themselves and seeking freedom for the social
29
30 collectivity, we enter each of these independent variables in different models: Model *a* and
31
32 Model *b*, respectively.
33
34
35
36
37

38 Third, we test the significance of indirect effects (i.e., the effects of seeking autonomy on
39
40 business outcomes through the mediation of authoring and making declarations). We employ
41
42 bootstrap confidence intervals and follow Hayes's (2013, p.106, 112) steps. In particular, this
43
44 study estimates bootstrap bias corrected confidence interval estimations for indirect effects using
45
46 5,000 random samples.
47
48
49

50 Depending on the measurement of mediators and dependent variables, we employ logistic
51
52 regressions (for authoring personal change, making declarations, product and process innovation
53
54 and training employees models), ordered logistic regressions (for authoring social change,
55
56 revenue growth and success models), and ordinary least squares (for percentage of indigenous
57
58 employees models). All empirical models are estimated with robust standard errors.
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 **4. Findings**
8

9 **4.1.Descriptive Statistics**
10

11 Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 1. Around 49% of respondents report seeking
12 freedom for themselves, and 10% are seeking freedom for the social collectivity. For authoring
13 personal change, nearly 18% of respondents set their own schedule and 23% aim to control their
14 destiny. As for authoring social change, 61% rate community employment as important or very
15 important, while 65% rate community service as important or very important. Approximately
16 13% of respondents engage in *making declarations* (identify as an indigenous business). About
17 43% of respondents report that their revenue has increased in the last year; 55% indicate their
18 businesses are very successful or extremely successful; 49% report that their businesses
19 introduced new products or services, while 40% indicate that their businesses introduced new
20 services in the past three years; 67% businesses support or provide training or education for its
21 employees; and on average businesses in the sample have 65% of indigenous employees.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 [Insert Table 1 here]
39
40

41 Table 2 presents bivariate correlations. Freedom for themselves is positively correlated
42 with product innovation, process innovation, set own schedule, control destiny; and it is
43 negatively correlated with community service, age, and location on reserve. Freedom for the
44 social collectivity is positively correlated with training employees, percentage of indigenous
45 employees, community employment, community service, making declarations, firm size, and
46 location on reserve. Freedom for the social collectivity is negatively correlated with set own
47 schedule and control destiny.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 [Insert Table 2 here]
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

4.2. Testing hypotheses 1 and 2a: seeking autonomy, authoring and making declarations

Table 3 presents the results on the influence of *seeking autonomy* (freedom for themselves and freedom for the social collectivity) on *authoring* and *making declarations*. In Models 1 and 2, logistic regressions results show that freedom for themselves has a positive relation with control destiny (0.578, $p < 0.001$) while freedom for the social collectivity has a negative relation with set own schedule (-0.732, $p < 0.051$) and control destiny (-0.697, $p < 0.05$). Results also indicate that freedom for themselves is negatively related with community service (-0.204, $p < 0.091$) and that freedom for the social collectivity is positively related with business models that value community employment (0.958, $p < 0.001$) or community service (0.946, $p < 0.001$). Overall, these findings provide support to H1, which states that there is a trade-off between authoring practices such that (a) entrepreneurs seeking freedom for the social collectivity will be less likely to enact practices that allow for individual flexibility and control (authoring personal change); while (b) entrepreneurs seeking freedom for themselves will be less likely to enact authoring practices that address social change.

Findings in Models 3 and 4, indicate that freedom for the social collectivity has a positive association with making declarations (1.083, $p < 0.01$), while freedom for themselves is not significantly related to making declarations (-0.366, $p > 0.10$). These findings provide support to H2a, which states that compared to entrepreneurs seeking “freedom for themselves”, entrepreneurs seeking “freedom for the social collectivity” will be more likely to engage in making declarations that challenge the status quo.

[Insert Table 3 here]

4.3. Testing Hypothesis 2b: moderating effect of location on reserve in the relationship between seeking autonomy and making declarations

1
2
3
4 In Table 3, Models 5a and 5b, present the moderation results of location on reserve. In Model 5a,
5
6 the moderation effect of location on reserve on the relationship between freedom for themselves
7
8 and making declarations is positive (0.938, $p < 0.025$). Figure 2a depicts that for those
9
10 entrepreneurs whose businesses are located on reserve, freedom for themselves has a positive
11
12 relationship with making declarations; however, for those businesses located off reserve,
13
14 freedom for themselves has a negative relationship with making declarations.
15
16
17

18
19 In Model 5b, the moderation effect of location on reserve on the association between
20
21 freedom for the social collectivity and making declarations is negative (-1.145, $p < 0.061$). Figure
22
23 2b visualizes the moderation effect. For entrepreneurs whose businesses are located off reserve,
24
25 the relationship between freedom for the social collectivity and making declarations is positive;
26
27 however, for those businesses located on reserve there is a flat relationship between freedom for
28
29 the social collectivity and making declarations.
30
31
32

33
34 Altogether, these results provide mixed support to H2b. The social context (i.e., location
35
36 on a reserve) moderates the relationship between seeking freedom and making declarations. In
37
38 the case of freedom for themselves, location on reserve has a positive moderation; however, in
39
40 the case of freedom for the social collectivity, it is entrepreneurs located off reserve who tend to
41
42 be engaged in making declarations.
43
44

45
46 [Insert Figure 2 here]
47

48 **4.4. Testing Hypothesis 3: mediation of authoring and making declarations**

49

50 Table 4 presents the results on the impact of seeking autonomy, authoring and making
51
52 declarations on a range of business outcomes. Table 5 summarizes direct and indirect effects of
53
54 seeking autonomy on business outcomes.
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 ***Revenue growth***
5

6
7 Freedom for the social collectivity affects revenue growth through the mediation of set own
8
9 schedule. In Table 4, Model 6b, set own schedule negatively affects revenue growth (-0.481,
10
11 $p < 0.006$), and in Table 3, freedom for the social collectivity negatively affects set own schedule
12
13 (-0.732, $p < 0.051$). In this sense, freedom for the social collectivity indirectly affects revenue
14
15 growth. We tested the significance of this indirect effect following the procedure of Hayes
16
17 (2013) as indicated previously. In Table 5, the indirect effect of freedom for the social
18
19 collectivity has a bias corrected confidence interval that lies between .027 and 1.069, at 95%
20
21 confidence level. In other words, freedom for the social collectivity affects revenue growth by
22
23 having less flexibility to set own schedule.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 ***Success***
32

33
34 Freedom for themselves and freedom for the social collectivity indirectly affect perceptions of
35
36 success. In Table 4, Model 7a, community service positively affects success (0.2, $p < 0.004$), and
37
38 in Table 3 freedom for themselves affects community service (-0.204, $p < 0.091$). In Table 5, the
39
40 bias corrected confidence interval of the indirect effect of freedom for themselves on success
41
42 through community service lies between -0.106 and -0.003, at 90% confidence level. These
43
44 results show that freedom for themselves indirectly affects success via community service.
45
46
47

48
49 Freedom for the social collectivity affects success through the mediation of set own
50
51 schedule and community service. In Table 4, Model 7b, set own schedule is negatively related to
52
53 success (-0.512, $p < 0.002$) and community service is positively related to success (0.201,
54
55 $p < 0.004$). In Table 3, Model 1b, freedom for the social collectivity is negatively related to set
56
57 own schedule (-0.732, $p < 0.051$), and in Model 4b, freedom for the social collectivity is
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 positively related to community service (0.946, $p < 0.001$). As reported in Table 5, bias corrected
5
6 indirect effects of freedom for the social collectivity on success are significant at 95% confidence
7
8 level (via set own schedule) and at 99% confidence level (via community service).
9
10

11 12 13 14 ***Product innovation***

15
16 Freedom for themselves affects product innovation through the mediation of control destiny. In
17
18 Table 4, Model 8a, control destiny affects product innovation (0.521, $p < 0.003$), and in Table 3,
19
20 Model 2a, freedom for themselves affects control destiny (0.575, $p < 0.001$). We test the indirect
21
22 effect of freedom for themselves on product innovation through control destiny and find that the
23
24 bootstrap confidence interval lies between 0.014 and 0.729, at 99% confidence level.
25
26
27

28
29 Freedom for the social collectivity affects product innovation also through the mediation
30
31 of control destiny. In Table 4, Model 8b, control destiny affects product innovation (0.553,
32
33 $p < 0.001$), and in Table 3, Model 2b, freedom for the social collectivity affects control destiny (-
34
35 0.697, $p < 0.05$). In Table 5, the indirect effect of freedom for the social collectivity on product
36
37 innovation via control destiny (-0.385) is significant at 95% confidence level.
38
39
40
41
42

43 ***Process innovation***

44
45 Freedom for themselves affects process innovation through the mediation of control destiny and
46
47 community service. In Table 4, Model 9a, control destiny (0.492, $p < 0.005$) and community
48
49 service (0.198, $p < 0.006$) are related to process innovation. In Table 3, Models 2a and 4a,
50
51 freedom for themselves is related to control destiny (0.575, $p < 0.001$) and to community service
52
53 (-0.204, $p < 0.091$). Table 5 shows that indirect effects of freedom for themselves on process
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 innovation via set own schedule (0.283) and community service (-0.04) are significant at 99%
5
6 and 90% confidence levels, respectively.
7
8

9 Freedom for the social collectivity affects process innovation through the mediation of set
10 own schedule, control destiny and community service. In Table 4, Model 9b, set own schedule (-
11 0.574, $p < 0.003$), control destiny (0.548, $p < 0.002$), and community service (0.177, $p < 0.014$) are
12
13 related to process innovation. In Table 5, Models 1b, 2b and 4b, freedom for the social
14
15 collectivity is related to set own schedule (-0.732, $p < 0.051$), control destiny (-0.697, $p < 0.05$) and
16
17 community service (0.946, $p < 0.001$). In Table 5, indirect effects of freedom for the social
18
19 collectivity on process innovation via set own schedule (0.42), control destiny (-0.382) and
20
21 community service (0.167) are significant at 95% confidence level.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 *Training employees*

32 While freedom for themselves does not affect training employees directly or indirectly, freedom
33
34 for the social collectivity is directly related to training employees (1.143, $p < 0.01$). We did not
35
36 find empirical evidence of the mediation of authoring and making declarations between seeking
37
38 autonomy and training employees.
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 *Percentage of indigenous employees*

46 Freedom for themselves is indirectly related to percentage of indigenous employees through the
47
48 moderated mediation of making declarations. In Table 4, Model 11a, making declarations
49
50 positively affects percentage of indigenous employees (0.118, $p < 0.002$). In Table 3, Model 5a,
51
52 the interaction between freedom for themselves and location on reserve has an effect on making
53
54 declarations (0.938, $p < 0.025$). Table 5 shows that the indirect effect of freedom for themselves
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 on the percentage of indigenous employees via the mediated moderation of making declarations
5
6 and location on reserve is significant at 95% confidence interval.
7
8

9 Freedom for the social collectivity indirectly affects the percentage of indigenous
10 employees through the mediation of community employment and making declarations. In Table
11 4, Model 11b, community employment (0.047, $p < 0.002$) and making declarations (0.116,
12 $p < 0.002$) affect the percentage of indigenous employees. In Table 3, Models 3b and 5b, freedom
13
14 for the social collectivity affects community employment (0.958, $p < 0.001$) and making
15
16 declarations (1.083, $p < 0.005$). In Table 3, Model 5b, the interaction between freedom for the
17
18 social collectivity and location on reserve also affects making declarations (-1.145, $p < 0.061$).
19
20 Table 5 shows that indirect effects of freedom for the social collectivity on the percentage of
21
22 indigenous employees through the mediation of community employment (0.045), making
23
24 declarations (0.126) and the moderation with location on reserve (-0.133) are significant at 99%
25
26 and 95% confidence levels, respectively.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Altogether, these findings support H3 which states that authoring and making declaration
37 practices will mediate the relationship between the initial seeking freedom motivation and the
38
39 outcomes achieved. In particular, freedom for themselves indirectly affects business outcomes
40
41 through the mediation of control destiny, community service and making declarations.
42
43

44 Additionally, freedom for the social collectivity indirectly affects business outcomes via the
45
46 mediation of set own schedule, control destiny, community employment, community service and
47
48 making declarations.
49
50
51

52
53 [Insert Table 4 here]

54
55 [Insert Table 5 here]

5. Discussion and concluding remarks

This paper studied entrepreneurial practices and outcomes from the perspective of entrepreneurship as emancipation. Particularly, our study centered on how entrepreneurs seeking freedom for themselves differ from those seeking to enact change for the social collectivity in their authoring and making declarations practices. We tested our hypotheses on a representative national sample of indigenous businesses in Canada.

5.1. Theoretical implications

The results from our analysis provided us with three main findings, which we in turn discuss. First, our study makes a theoretical contribution by unveiling the significant relationship between two core elements - seeking autonomy and authoring - of Rindova et al.'s (2009) emancipatory framework. Our theorizing and findings indicate that entrepreneurs seeking "freedom for themselves" approached *authoring* in a significantly different way compared to those seeking to enact change in the social collective of which they are a part. Those who are seeking freedom for themselves *are more likely to control their destiny* (and therefore more likely to author personal change); however, those who are seeking freedom for the social collectivity are more likely to author social change and *less likely to set their own schedules and to control their destiny*. This result is particularly intriguing and calls for more attention towards the role of entrepreneur's identity and the way they may perceive themselves as belonging to a certain category (Conger et al., 2018), such that seeing themselves as entrepreneurs with a social mission may pose a conflict with values of individual freedom and flexibility. Entrepreneurs' sense of identity is therefore important in understanding choices related to specific *authoring* practices. Given that we examined entrepreneurship from the perspective of emancipation, this finding presents

1
2
3
4 interesting implications regarding the emancipatory potential of entrepreneurship in settings
5
6 where the collective well-being might take precedence over individual expressions of freedom.
7
8 Our results indicate a trade-off between individual-focused and community-focused *authoring*
9
10 practices. Engaging in entrepreneurial activities to break up constraints for the social collective
11
12 might lead to self-imposed constraints for the individual flexibility and control. As Van Gelderen
13
14 (2016: 560) states, “entrepreneurs have the autonomy to decide to forego autonomy.” Our
15
16 findings, thus, advance the emancipatory framework by revealing the relationship between
17
18 *seeking autonomy* and *authoring*, and the trade-off in authoring practices depending on the initial
19
20 *seeking autonomy* motivation. This finding also invokes linkages to the literature on subjective
21
22 well-being as an outcome of entrepreneurial activities, where both personal psychological
23
24 functioning (autonomy and control, meaning and purpose) and social functioning (sense of
25
26 belonging and local support) are considered important mechanisms to achieve well-being (e.g.,
27
28 Nikolaev et al., 2019).

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Second, regarding entrepreneurs’ engagement in *making declarations*, our findings indicate that those entrepreneurs who view autonomy as freedom for the social collectivity are more likely to engage in discursive acts. However, our findings present nuanced understanding about the moderating role of social context on initial motivation (freedom for themselves and freedom for the social collective). While entrepreneurs seeking freedom for themselves and located on reserve were more likely to engage in making declarations, for the groups of entrepreneurs seeking freedom for the social collective it was the ones off reserve who were more likely to do so. Contrary to our expectations based on social identity theory (Stryker and Burke, 2000), entrepreneurs off reserve seeking to create social change seemed to assert their indigenous identity more. The salience of their identity and the willingness to act on it was not

1
2
3
4 diminished, but amplified off reserve. Similar findings have been reported for other ethnic
5
6 groups when located outside of their native settings. For instance, Ruby (2006) revealed that
7
8 Muslim Canadian women attached more importance to wearing a veil while in Canada than in
9
10 their countries of origin. Our findings suggest that, from a social identity perspective,
11
12 emancipatory entrepreneurial acts may bring the entrepreneur's (ethnic) identity to the fore when
13
14 placed in a "stranger in a strange land" context (O'Neil and Ucbasaran, 2016), while trying to
15
16 achieve objectives for the social collective. Although no previous research has examined the
17
18 relationship between *seeking autonomy* and *making declarations* from an emancipatory
19
20 perspective, our findings complement the literature which "emphasizes the role of language as a
21
22 key tool for actor agency" (Ruebottom, 2013, p. 99) by adding the importance of language and
23
24 discourse in the context of seeking freedom for the social collectivity.
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Third, our findings also show how the authoring and making declaration practices impact
32
33 the outcomes achieved, and mediate the relationship between seeking autonomy and
34
35 entrepreneurial outcomes. Extant research has examined outcomes of *authoring* and has not
36
37 studied the different outcomes as a result of *seeking autonomy for oneself vs. the social*
38
39 *collective*. For instance, Jennings et al. (2016) report that those authoring personal change are
40
41 more likely to report higher levels of psychic benefits, satisfaction with their work-life balance,
42
43 family satisfaction or degree of overall life satisfaction. Other studies – in the context of women
44
45 entrepreneurs in developing areas – point to emancipatory outcomes for women such as personal
46
47 development / satisfaction, and economic independence / financial contribution to the family
48
49 (Al-Dajani et al., 2015; Haugh and Talwar, 2016). Our findings add to the understanding of the
50
51 differential outcomes of seeking autonomy by taking a broader view of emancipation to include
52
53 both emancipatory motivations: seeking freedom for oneself and seeking freedom for the social
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 collectivity, and the authoring and making declarations practices that lead to the achievement of
5
6 different outcomes. By specifying a mediation role for authoring and making declarations, we
7
8 offer a more nuanced understanding about how the initial motivation of entrepreneurs drives the
9
10 adoption of different practices, which consequently lead to differential performance outcomes.
11
12
13 While entrepreneurs seeking freedom for the social collectivity were more likely to enact
14
15 practices that would lead them to social outcomes such as employee training and providing
16
17 employment to indigenous employees, entrepreneurs looking for freedom for themselves
18
19 presented more varied practices that may lead to a broad array of outcomes, such as decrease in
20
21 revenue (if entrepreneurs prioritize other aspects of their lives and set their scheduled
22
23 accordingly), increase in innovation (if entrepreneurs prioritize self-expression), or achievement
24
25 of social outcomes (offering employment for indigenous employees) via the mediation of making
26
27 declarations. Another interesting finding is the effect of seeking freedom on innovation. While
28
29 entrepreneurs seeking freedom for themselves were found to achieve product and process
30
31 innovation via the mediation of control destiny, entrepreneurs seeking freedom for the social
32
33 collectivity were following a different path to process innovation via the mediation of
34
35 community service. This finding complements recent studies which find that novel processes and
36
37 social dimension of business activities can be balanced (Candi et al., 2019).
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **5.2. Practical implications**

49
50 The results of our study also provide practical implications for entrepreneurs seeking to achieve
51
52 change for themselves or for the community in which they are engaged. First, entrepreneurs need
53
54 to be aware of the trade-offs inherent in choosing to focus on social goals at the expense of
55
56 feelings of personal freedom (control over their destiny, personal flexibility). If entrepreneurs
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 focus on achieving benefits for the social collective while limiting their own personal autonomy,
5
6 feelings of burnout may occur that can impact entrepreneurs' well-being and subsequently their
7
8 ability to fulfil the social mission they are pursuing. Individual's well-being is affected by social
9
10 functioning, such as social belonging and relationships arising from engagement in social
11
12 mission activities, but it is also impacted by psychological functioning, including feeling of self-
13
14 determination and autonomy (Nikolaev et al., 2019; Ryan and Deci, 2000; Ryff, 2019).
15
16
17
18 Therefore, entrepreneurs looking for social change should be aware of the delicate balance
19
20
21 between working toward social goals and maintaining their personal psychological functioning.
22

23
24 Second, our nuanced findings about innovation outcomes suggest that there are different
25
26 pathways to innovation. Innovation is usually associated with achieving the creative vision of the
27
28 entrepreneur for bringing new products to market. Indeed, for entrepreneurs looking for freedom
29
30 for themselves, the path to innovation was mediated by controlling their destiny and expressing
31
32 their creative potential; however, entrepreneurs interested in social change were able to achieve
33
34 process innovation via the mediation of community service. This finding has important
35
36 implications for entrepreneurs and suggests that embracing community service can be a path to
37
38 designing new processes that can bring benefits to the entrepreneurs and their communities.
39
40
41 Embeddedness within the local community can open up new avenues of organizing, novel
42
43 understanding of clients' needs, and co-creation of value together with the community (Lashitew
44
45 et al., 2020).
46
47
48

49
50 Finally, entrepreneurs' willingness to engage in discursive acts embracing their identity is
51
52 important for emancipation. In our context, entrepreneurs located on reserve were more inclined
53
54 to voice the indigenous identity of their businesses as part of their competitive advantages. More
55
56 interestingly, entrepreneurs located off reserve were more prone to engage in making
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 declarations (expressing their indigenous identity) when their initial motivations were to seek
5
6 change for the social collective. Voicing out entrepreneurs' indigenous identity has further effect
7
8 on creating more employment for indigenous peoples in and outside of indigenous communities.
9
10 In this sense, entrepreneurs are encouraged to express their identities as part of their business
11
12 practices because their identities provide entrepreneurs with culture-specific values and skills to
13
14 be used in the marketplace to bring about social and economic change (Dana, 2015; Hindle &
15
16 Moroz, 2010).
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 **5.3. Concluding remarks**

24
25 Overall, our research advances the discussion on emancipatory entrepreneurship by focusing on
26
27 entrepreneurs' attempts to dislodge the status quo. We do so by conceptualizing and
28
29 operationalizing all three aspects of Rindova et al.'s (2009) framework and examining a diverse
30
31 range of performance outcomes of emancipation in a large representative data set of indigenous
32
33 SMEs in Canada. The paper answers recent calls that view the entrepreneurial process as one in
34
35 which the head engages the heart (Shepherd, 2015) by going beyond financial goals. This paper
36
37 thus contributes to the literature about the change-creating potential of entrepreneurship by
38
39 differentiating between the different "freedoms" that entrepreneurs pursue and how this initial
40
41 motivation affects subsequent *authoring* and *making declarations* practices, as well as outcomes.
42
43 Furthermore, by focusing on a sample of indigenous entrepreneurs, we join others (e.g., Haar et
44
45 al., 2019; Olabisi et al., 2019; Peredo et al., 2004; Peredo and McLean, 2013) in showcasing the
46
47 uniqueness and contributions of indigenous communities around the world to business practices.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

6. Limitations and opportunities for future research

While our study advances the literature on emancipatory entrepreneurship, it also has some limitations that offer fruitful avenues for future research. Our research context – indigenous businesses – provided an excellent setting for studying practices and outcomes from entrepreneurship taking an emancipation perspective. Because indigenous people over the world have long faced economic hardship as well as challenges to preserving their traditions and identity, an emancipation perspective seems particularly appropriate to examine their entrepreneurial activities. While a useful lesson for all, we do not claim that the Canadian experience is universally generalizable. Canada has strong institutions that support citizens, fair rules, and generous welfare packages, so we cannot expect findings to be identical in developing countries that may experience corruption and other forces. Consequently, a limitation is that given the importance of the institutional environment, the generalizability of findings to other contexts is limited.

One of the questions that remains unanswered is the appropriate translation of the emancipation framework to different contexts. For instance, what constitutes *making declarations* in a non-indigenous context will likely be very different from our conceptualization and measurement in this paper. Indeed, because emancipation means different things in different contexts (Calas et al., 2009; Jennings et al., 2016), future research can usefully explore diverse measures that reflect the elements of the emancipation framework. Furthermore, in the current study we examined performance outcomes at the organizational level only. Another promising line for future inquiries could focus on the individual (vs. organizational) consequences or outcomes from emancipation, especially when entrepreneurs are unable to achieve the desired “freedom” (be that individual-focused or collective-focused). Rindova et al. (2009) realize that

1
2
3
4 entrepreneurs might find themselves trapped in the arrangements they make to gain legitimacy
5
6 and access to resources. Empirical research also has found that autonomy does not come
7
8 automatically with business ownership (Van Gelderen, 2016), and that “many entrepreneurs find
9
10 themselves unable to enact their dreams in practice” (Jennings et al., 2016, p. 21). The extent to
11
12 which being unable to enact their dreams influences entrepreneurs’ cognition, passion, and long-
13
14 term organizational or social outcomes presents an important future line of research. Lastly,
15
16 given that this study is an early attempt to model empirically all three elements of the
17
18 emancipatory perspective, we relied on a cross-sectional representative sample to test our
19
20 hypotheses. Future research can use longitudinal designs to further study the processes within the
21
22 emancipation perspective (Chandra, 2017).
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

References

- Al-Dajani, H., Carter, S., Shaw, E., & Marlow, S. (2015). Entrepreneurship among the Displaced and Dispossessed: Exploring the Limits of Emancipatory Entrepreneurship. *British Journal of Management*, 26, 713–730.
- Anderson, R., Dana, L.-P., & Dana, T. (2006). Indigenous land rights, entrepreneurship, and economic development in Canada: “Opting-in” to the global economy. *Journal of World Business*, 41, 45–55.
- Anderson, T. (2019). Results from the 2016 Census: Housing, income and residential dissimilarity among Indigenous people in Canadian cities. *Statistics Canada*. Available at <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/75-006-x/2019001/article/00018-eng.htm>.
- Barth, F. (1963). *The role of the entrepreneur and social change in northern Norway*. Bergen: Norwegian University Press.
- Barth, F. (1967). On the study of social change. *American Anthropologist*, 69 (9), 661–669.
- Battilana, J. & Lee, M. (2014). Advancing Research on Hybrid Organizing – Insights from the Study of Social Enterprises. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 8 (1), 397–441.
- Battiste, M., & Henderson, J.Y. (2000). *Protecting Indigenous Knowledge and Heritage: A Global Challenge*. Saskatoon: Saskatchewan, Canada: Purich.
- Birley, S., & Westhead, P. (1994). A taxonomy of business start-up reasons and their impact on firm growth and size. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 9, 7–31.
- Calas, M., Smircich, L., & Bourne, K. (2009). Extending the boundaries: reframing “entrepreneurship as social change” through feminist perspectives. *Academy of Management Review*, 34(3), 552–569.
- Canadian Council for Aboriginal Business. (2010). *Promise and Prosperity: The Aboriginal Business Survey*. Available at <https://www.ccab.com/research/publications/private-business/promise-and-prosperity-2010/>.
- Candi, M., Melia, M., & Colurcio, M. (2019). Two Birds with One Stone: The Quest for Addressing Both Business Goals and Social Needs with Innovation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 160, 1019–1033.
- Carsrud, A., & Brännback, M. (2011). Entrepreneurial Motivations: What Do We Still Need to Know? *Journal of Small Business Management*, 49(1), 9–26.
- Carter, N. M., Gartner, W. B., Shaver, K. G., & Gatewood, E. J. (2003). The career reasons of nascent entrepreneurs. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18, 13–39.
- CBC news (2021). Mine blockade sparks solidarity protests across Nunavut. Available at <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/north/mine-blockade-sparks-solidarity-protests-across-nunavut-1.5906285>.
- Chandra, Y. (2017). Social entrepreneurship as emancipatory work. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 32 (6), 657–673.
- Conger, M., McMullen, J.S., Bergman, B.J., & York, J. (2018). Category membership, identity control, and the reevaluation of prosocial opportunities. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 33 (2), 179–206.
- Dana, L.-P. (1995). Entrepreneurship in a remote sub-Arctic community: Nome, Alaska. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 20 (1), 55–72.

- 1
2
3
4 Dana, L-P. (1996). Self-employment in the Canadian sub-Arctic: an exploratory study. *Canadian*
5 *Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 13 (1), 65-77.
6
7 Dana, L-P. (1997). The Origins of Self- Employment in Ethno- cultural Communities:
8 Distinguishing Between Orthodox Entrepreneurship and Reactionary Enterprise.
9 *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 14 (1), 52-68.
10
11 Dana, L-P. (2007). Toward a multidisciplinary definition of indigenous entrepreneurship. In L-P.
12 Dana, & R. B. Anderson, *International Handbook of Research on Indigenous*
13 *Entrepreneurship* (pp. 3-7). Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar.
14
15 Dana, L-P. (2015). Indigenous entrepreneurship: an emerging field of research. *International*
16 *Journal of Business and Globalisation*, 14 (2), 158-169.
17
18 Dana, L-P., & Light, I. (2011). Two forms of community entrepreneurship in Finland: are there
19 differences between Finnish and Sámi reindeer husbandry entrepreneurs?"
20 *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 23 (5-6), 331-352.
21
22 Datta, P. & Gailey, R. (2012). Empowering women through social entrepreneurship: Case of a
23 women's cooperative in India. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 36(3), 569-587.
24
25 Davies, I. A., & Doherty, B. (2019). Balancing a Hybrid Business Model: The Search for
26 Equilibrium at Cafédirect. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 157, 1043-1066.
27
28 Dey, P., & Mason, C. (2018). Overcoming constraints of collective imagination: An inquiry into
29 activist entrepreneuring, disruptive truth-telling and the creation of 'possible worlds'.
30 *Journal of Business Venturing*, 33 (1), 84-99.
31
32 Dorado, S., & Ventresca, M.J. (2013). Crescive entrepreneurship in complex social problems:
33 Institutional conditions for entrepreneurial engagement. *Journal of Business Venturing*,
34 28 (1), 69-82.
35
36 Drori, I. & Honig, B. (2013). A Process Model of Internal and External Legitimacy.
37 *Organization Studies*, 34(3), 345-376.
38
39 Eddleston, K. & Powell, G. (2012). Nurturing Entrepreneurs' Work-Family Balance: A
40 Gendered Perspective. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 36 (3), 513-541.
41
42 Fauchart, E. & Gruber, M. (2011). Darwinians, Communitarians, And Missionaries: The Role of
43 Founder Identity in Entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54 (5), 935-
44 957.
45
46 Goss, D., Jones, R., Betta, M., & Latham, J. (2011). Power as Practice: A Micro-sociological
47 Analysis of the Dynamics of Emancipatory Entrepreneurship. *Organization Studies*,
48 32(2), 211-229.
49
50 Haar, J., Roche, M., & Brougham, D. (2019). Indigenous Insights into Ethical Leadership: A
51 Study of Māori Leaders. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 160, 621-640.
52
53 Haugh, H., & Talwar, A. (2016). Linking Social Entrepreneurship and Social Change: The
54 Mediating Role of Empowerment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 133, 643-658.
55
56 Hayes, A. F. (2013). Introduction to mediation, moderation and conditional process analysis: A
57 regression-based approach, New York, New York: The Guilford Press.
58
59 Hessels, J., van Gelderen, M., & Thurik, R. (2008). Entrepreneurial aspirations, motivations, and
60 their drivers. *Small Business Economics*, 31, 323-339.
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Hindle, K. & Moroz, P. (2010). Indigenous entrepreneurship as a research field: developing a
5 definitional framework from the emerging canon. *International Entrepreneurship and*
6 *Management Journal*, 6, 357–385.
- 8 Hindle, K., & Lansdowne, M. (2002). Brave spirits on new paths: toward a globally relevant
9 paradigm of indigenous entrepreneurship research. *Babson College Kauffman*
10 *Foundation Entrepreneurship Research Conference*. University of Colorado at Boulder.
- 12 Hota, P. K., Subramanian, B., & Narayanamurthy, G. (2020). Mapping the Intellectual Structure
13 of Social Entrepreneurship Research: A Citation/Co-citation Analysis. *Journal of*
14 *Business Ethics*, 166, 89–114.
- 16 Imas, J.M., Wilson, N., & Weston, A. (2012). Barefoot entrepreneurs. *Organization*, 19(5), 563–
17 585.
- 19 International Labour Organization (2019). Implementing the ILO Indigenous and Tribal Peoples
20 Convention No. 169: Towards an inclusive, sustainable and just future. Available at:
21 [https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/---](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/---publ/documents/publication/wcms_735607.pdf)
22 [publ/documents/publication/wcms_735607.pdf](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/---publ/documents/publication/wcms_735607.pdf)
- 24 Jennings, J. E., & Brush, C. (2013). Research on women entrepreneurs: Challenges to (and from)
25 the broader entrepreneurship literature? *The Academy of Management Annals*, 7 (1), 663-
26 715.
- 28 Jennings, J. E., Jennings, P. D., & Sharifian, M. (2016). Living the dream? Assessing the
29 “entrepreneurship as emancipation” perspective in a developed region. *Entrepreneurship*
30 *Theory and Practice*, 40(1), 81-110.
- 32 Jennings, J.E., & McDougald, M.S. (2007). Work-family interface experiences and coping
33 strategies: Implications for entrepreneurship research and practice. *Academy of*
34 *Management Review*, 32(3), 747–760.
- 36 Lalonde, R. N., Cila, J., & Yampolsky, M. (2016). *Canada, a fertile ground for intergroup*
37 *relations and social identity theory*. In S. McKeown, R. Haji, & N. Ferguson (Eds.),
38 *Peace psychology book series. Understanding peace and conflict through social identity*
39 *theory: Contemporary global perspectives* (p. 261–276). Springer International
40 Publishing.
- 42 Lashitew, A. A., Bals, L. & van Tulder, R. (2020). Inclusive Business at the Base of the
43 Pyramid: The Role of Embeddedness for Enabling Social Innovations. *Journal of*
44 *Business Ethics*, 162, 421–448.
- 46 Light, I. H., & Dana, L-P. (2013). Boundaries of social capital in entrepreneurship.
47 *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice*, 37(3), 603-624.
- 48 McAdam, M., Crowley, C. & Harrison, R.T. (2020). Digital girl: cyberfeminism and the
49 emancipatory potential of digital entrepreneurship in emerging economies. *Small*
50 *Business Economics*, 55, 349–362.
- 52 Martens, M., Jennings, J., & Jennings, P.D. (2007). Do the Stories They Tell Get Them the
53 Money They Need? The Role of Entrepreneurial Narratives in Resource Acquisition.
54 *Academy of Management Journal*, 50 (5), 1107–1132.
- 56 McMullen, J. & Warnick, B. (2016). Should We Require Every New Venture to Be a Hybrid
57 Organization? *Journal of Management Studies*, 53 (4), 630-662.
- 59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Murnieks, C., Mosakowski, E., & Cardon, M. (2014). Pathways of Passion: Identity Centrality,
5 Passion, and Behavior Among Entrepreneurs. *Journal of Management*, 40 (6), 1583–
6 1606.
7
8 Nikolaev, B., Boudreaux, C.J., & Wood, M. (2019). Entrepreneurship and Subjective Well-
9 Being: The Mediating Role of Psychological Functioning. *Entrepreneurship Theory and
10 Practice*, online first: March 15, 2019, DOI: 10.1177/1042258719830314.
11
12 O’Neil, I. & Ucbasaran, D. (2016). Balancing “what matters to me” with “what matters to them”:
13 Exploring the legitimation process of environmental entrepreneurs. *Journal of Business
14 Venturing*, 31, 133–152.
15
16 Olabisi, J., Kwesiga, E., Juma, N., & Tang, Z. (2019). Stakeholder Transformation Process: The
17 Journey of an Indigenous Community. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 159, 1-21.
18
19 Peredo, A. M., Anderson, R., Galbraith, C., Honig, B., & Dana, L-P. (2004). Towards a theory of
20 indigenous entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small
21 Business*, 1 (1/2), 1-20.
22
23 Peredo, A. M., & Chrisman, J. J. (2006). Toward a theory of community-based enterprise.
24 *Academy of Management Review*, 31(2), 309-328.
25
26 Peredo, A. M., & McLean, M. (2013). Indigenous Development and the Cultural Captivity of
27 Entrepreneurship. *Business & Society*, 52 (4), 592-620.
28
29 Rindova, V., Barry, D., & Ketchen, D. (2009). Entrepreneurship as emancipation. *Academy of
30 Management Review*, 34(3), 477-491.
31
32 Ruby, T. (2006). Listening to the voices of hijab. *Women’s Studies International Forum*, 29, 54–
33 66.
34
35 Ruebottom, T. (2013). The microstructures of rhetorical strategy in social entrepreneurship:
36 Building legitimacy through heroes and villains. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 28 (1),
37 98–116.
38
39 Ruebottom, T., & Toubiana, M. (2020). Constraints and Opportunities of Stigma:
40 Entrepreneurial Emancipation in the Sex Industry. *Academy of Management Journal*,
41 Published Online: 21 July 2020.
42
43 Ryan, R., & Deci, E. (2000). Self-Determination Theory and the Facilitation of Intrinsic
44 Motivation, Social Development, and Well-Being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68-78.
45
46 Ryff, C.D. (2019). Entrepreneurship and eudaimonic well-being: Five venues for new science.
47 *Journal of Business Venturing*, 34 (4), 646-663.
48
49 Sabella, A.R., & El-Far, M.T. (2019). Entrepreneurship as an everyday form of resistance: An
50 exploration of the experiences of Palestinian women street vendors in the occupied Old
51 City of Jerusalem. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 25 (6),
52 1212-1235.
53
54 Schumpeter J. A. (1934). *The Theory of Economic Development. An Inquiry into Profits,
55 Capital, Credit, Interest, and the Business Cycle*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University
56 Press.
57
58 Scott, L., Dolan, C., Johnstone-Louis, M., Sugden, K., & Wu, M. (2012). Enterprise and
59 inequality: A study of Avon in South Africa. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*,
60 36(3), 543–568.
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Shepherd, D.A. (2015). Party On! A call for entrepreneurship research that is more interactive,
5 activity based, cognitively hot, compassionate, and prosocial. *Journal of Business*
6 *Venturing*, 30, 489–507.
- 8 Siqueira, A.C., Guenster, N., Vanacker, T., & Crucke, S. (2018). A longitudinal comparison of
9 capital structure between young for-profit social and commercial enterprises. *Journal of*
10 *Business Venturing*, 33 (2), 225–240.
- 12 Statistics Canada (2016). Aboriginal peoples in Canada: Key results from the 2016 Census.
13 Available at: [https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/171025/dq171025a-](https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/171025/dq171025a-eng.htm?indid=14430-1&indgeo=0)
14 [eng.htm?indid=14430-1&indgeo=0](https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/171025/dq171025a-eng.htm?indid=14430-1&indgeo=0).
- 16 Stets, J. E., & Burke, P. J. (2000). Identity theory and social identity theory. *Social Psychology*
17 *Quarterly*, 63(3), 224–237.
- 19 Stryker, S. (1980). *Symbolic interactionism: A social structural version*. Menlo Park, CA:
20 Benjamin/Cummings.
- 22 Stryker, S., & Burke, P. J. (2000). The past, present, and future of an identity theory. *Social*
23 *Psychology Quarterly*, 63: 284-297.
- 25 Stryker, S., & Serpe, R. T. (1994). Identity salience and psychological centrality: Equivalent,
26 overlapping, or complementary concepts? *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 57: 16-35.
- 27 Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin;
28 S. Worchel (eds.). *The social psychology of intergroup relations*. Monterey, CA:
29 Brooks/Cole. pp. 33–47.
- 31 Tedmanson, D., Essers, C., Dey, P., & Verduyn, K. (2015). An Uncommon Wealth...
32 Transforming the Commons with Purpose, for People and Not for Profit! *Journal of*
33 *Management Inquiry*, 24(4) 439–444.
- 35 United-Nations. (2015). *Indigenous people, indigenous voices: who are indigenous people?*
36 Retrieved from http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/5session_factsheet1.pdf.
- 38 Van Gelderen, M. (2016). Entrepreneurial Autonomy and its Dynamics. *Applied Psychology: An*
39 *International Review*, 65 (3), 541–567.
- 41 Van Gelderen, M., & Jansen, P.G.W. (2006). Autonomy as a startup motive. *Journal of Small*
42 *Business and Enterprise Development*, 13(1), 23–32.
- 44 Welter, F. (2011). Contextualising entrepreneurship- conceptual challenges and ways forward.
45 *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35(1), 165-184.
- 47 Welter, F., Baker, T., Audretsch, D., & Gartner, W. B. (2017). Everyday Entrepreneurship—A
48 Call for Entrepreneurship Research to Embrace Entrepreneurial Diversity.
49 *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 41, 3, 311–321.
- 51 Wiklund, J., Wright, M. & Zahra, S. (2019). Conquering Relevance: Entrepreneurship
52 Research’s Grand Challenge. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 43 (3), 419–436.
- 53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 **Table 1. Descriptive Statistics**
5

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Variables	Mean	Standard deviation	Min	Max	n
1. Freedom for themselves	0.487	0.500	0	1	1085
2. Freedom for the social collectivity	0.100	0.301	0	1	1085
3. Set own schedule	0.182	0.386	0	1	1012
4. Control destiny	0.231	0.422	0	1	1016
5. Community employment	3.731	1.324	1	5	1068
6. Community service	3.892	1.184	1	5	1071
7. Making declarations	0.129	0.336	0	1	997
8. Revenue growth					1064
- Decreased	0.208	0.407	0	1	
- Stay the same	0.364	0.481	0	1	
- Increased	0.428	0.495	0	1	
9. Success	3.609	0.844	1	5	1069
10. Product innovation	0.490	0.500	0	1	1088
11. Process innovation	0.402	0.491	0	1	1069
12. Training employees	0.668	0.471	0	1	707
13. % indigenous employees	0.647	0.366	0	1	670
14. Gender	0.372	0.483	0	1	1095
15. Age	49.167	10.895	19	89	1049
16. Education	0.359	0.480	0	1	1090
17. Firm age	11.45	9.224	0	54	1075
18. Firm size	6.982	13.132	0	98	1077
19. Location	0.409	0.492	0	1	1089

Table 2: Correlations

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1. Revenue growth	1																		
2. Success	0.295 ^d	1																	
3. Product innovation	0.101 ^d	0.163 ^d	1																
4. Process innovation	0.126 ^d	0.141 ^d	0.551 ^d	1															
5. Training employees	0.151 ^d	0.108 ^c	0.179 ^d	0.204 ^d	1														
6. % indigenous employees	-0.081 ^b	-0.072 ^a	-0.126 ^d	-0.089 ^b	-0.050	1													
7. Set own schedule	-0.07 ^b	-0.078 ^b	-0.053 ^a	-0.083 ^c	0.012	-0.076 ^a	1												
8. Control destiny	-0.011	0.000	0.122 ^d	0.125 ^d	0.047	-0.089 ^b	-0.035	1											
9. Community employment	0.066 ^b	0.13 ^d	0.067 ^b	0.070 ^b	0.05	0.147 ^d	-0.103 ^d	-0.006	1										
10. Community service	0.070 ^b	0.151 ^d	0.066 ^b	0.108 ^d	0.042	0.151 ^d	-0.020	-0.03	0.478 ^d	1									
11. Making declarations	0.009	0.001	0.01	-0.027	0.0508	0.125 ^c	-0.014	-0.019	0.029	0.048	1								
12. Freedom for themselves	-0.008	0.026	0.068 ^b	0.064 ^b	0.04	0.001	0.052 ^a	0.125 ^d	-0.022	-0.057 ^a	0.023	1							
13. Freedom for the social collectivity	0.023	0.005	-0.033	0.021	0.122 ^d	0.081 ^b	-0.076 ^b	-0.067 ^b	0.123 ^d	0.139 ^d	0.068 ^b	-0.184 ^d	1						
14. Gender	-0.012	0.003	-0.019	-0.01	-0.047	-0.016	0.063 ^b	-0.025	-0.034	0.073 ^b	0.044	-0.006	0.023	1					
15. Age	-0.126 ^d	-0.079 ^c	-0.107 ^d	-0.040	-0.025	0.176 ^d	-0.106 ^d	-0.040	-0.047	-0.008	-0.021	-0.100 ^d	0.046	-0.052 ^a	1				
16. Education	0.046	0.041	0.078 ^c	0.068 ^b	0.090 ^b	-0.032	-0.004	0.034	-0.039	-0.027	0.058 ^a	-0.001	0.037	0.141 ^d	-0.003	1			
17. Firm age	-0.109 ^d	0.07 ^b	-0.02	0.034	-0.019	0.092 ^b	-0.08 ^b	-0.02	0.053 ^a	0.027	-0.052	-0.007	-0.007	-0.049	0.452 ^d	-0.063 ^b	1		
18. Firm size	0.126 ^d	0.190 ^d	0.127 ^d	0.152 ^d	0.173 ^d	-0.072 ^a	-0.10 ^c	-0.028	0.210 ^d	0.100 ^d	-0.030	-0.043	0.080 ^c	-0.146 ^d	-0.002	0.007	0.149 ^d	1	
19. Location	-0.016	-0.014	-0.061 ^b	-0.028	-0.083 ^b	0.434 ^d	-0.044	-0.107 ^d	0.064 ^b	0.119 ^d	0.091 ^c	-0.076 ^b	0.052 ^a	0.024	0.077 ^b	-0.025	0.093 ^c	-0.040	1

^ap<.10; ^bp<.05; ^cp<.01; ^dp<.001.

Table 3: The influence of seeking autonomy on (mediators) authoring and making declarations

Independent variables	Authoring: personal change				Authoring: social change				Making declarations	
	Set own schedule		Control destiny		Community employment		Community service		Identified as indigenous	
	Model 1a	Model 1b	Model 2a	Model 2b	Model 3a	Model 3b	Model 4a	Model 4b	Model 5a	Model 5b
Freedom for themselves	0.182 (0.176)		0.575*** (0.163)		-0.108 (0.12)		-0.204† (0.121)		-0.366 (0.281)	
Freedom for the social collectivity		-0.732† (0.375)		-0.697* (0.319)		0.958*** (0.227)		0.946*** (0.214)		1.083** (0.388)
Gender	0.146 (0.191)	0.152 (0.191)	-0.162 (0.176)	-0.155 (0.175)	0.000 (0.13)	-0.009 (0.13)	0.432*** (0.133)	0.421** (0.134)	0.221 (0.223)	0.230 (0.221)
Age	-0.022* (0.009)	-0.022* (0.009)	-0.007 (0.08)	-0.009 (0.008)	-0.010 (0.006)	-0.012† (0.006)	-0.001 (0.006)	-0.001 (0.006)	-0.002 (0.01)	-0.005 (0.01)
Education	-0.116 (0.189)	-0.100 (0.189)	0.089 (0.17)	0.092 (0.168)	-0.068 (0.124)	-0.099 (0.125)	-0.175 (0.123)	-0.204† (0.124)	0.113 (0.218)	0.109 (0.216)
Firm age	-0.009 (0.012)	-0.009 (0.012)	0.006 (0.01)	0.007 (0.01)	0.010 (0.009)	0.011 (0.008)	0.000 (0.008)	0.000 (0.008)	-0.016 (0.013)	-0.013 (0.013)
Firm size	-0.024 (0.014)	-0.023 (0.014)	-0.002 (0.006)	-0.002 (0.006)	0.032*** (0.008)	0.030*** (0.008)	0.017** (0.006)	0.016** (0.005)	-0.001 (0.008)	-0.002 (0.008)
Location	-0.206 (0.178)	-0.205 (0.178)	-0.409* (0.17)	-0.426* (0.169)	0.295* (0.124)	0.294* (0.125)	0.431*** (0.126)	0.429*** (0.126)	0.116 (0.3)	0.740*** (0.217)
Freedom for themselves X Location									0.938* (0.418)	
Freedom for social collectivity X Location										-1.145† (0.61)
Industry	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included
n	928	928	932	932	972	972	979	979	916	916
Wald χ^2	40.38	42.12	42.16	37.77	59.46	77.96	65.79	81.34	43.23	41.5
Pseudo R ²	.052***	.056***	.046***	.039**	.025***	.032***	.025***	.031***	.059***	.061***
Log pseudolikelihood	-425.94	-424.185	-482.513	-486.215	-1376.993	-1367.083	-1317.477	-1317.477	-334.668	-334.003
Technique	Logistic regression		Logistic regression		Ordered logistic regression		Ordered logistic regression		Logistic regression	

†p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; ***p<.001. Robust standard errors in parentheses.

Table 4: Seeking autonomy, mediators and outcomes

Independent variables	Revenue growth		Success		Product innovation		Process innovation		Training employees		% Indigenous employees	
	Model 6a	Model 6b	Model 7a	Model 7b	Model 8a	Model 8b	Model 9a	Model 9b	Model 10a	Model 10b	Model 11a	Model 11b
Freedom for themselves	-0.012		0.006		0.243		0.311*		0.024		0.007	
Freedom for the social collectivity		-0.066		-0.048		0.010		0.369		1.143**		0.052
Set own schedule	-0.477**	-0.481**	-0.510**	-0.512**	-0.313†	-0.301	-0.608**	-0.574**	-0.066	-0.016	-0.018	-0.015
Control destiny	-0.162	-0.167	-0.104	-0.106	0.521**	0.553***	0.492**	0.548**	0.153	0.206	-0.011	-0.007
Community employment	0.016	0.017	-0.024	-0.024	0.026	0.027	-0.001	-0.005	-0.054	-0.064	0.048**	0.047**
Community service	0.081	0.083	0.200**	0.201**	0.083	0.075	0.198**	0.177*	0.117	0.082	-0.004	-0.006
Making declarations	0.134	0.140	-0.117	-0.114	0.034	0.041	-0.286	-0.292	0.436	0.402	0.118**	0.116**
Gender	0.111	0.110	0.057	0.057	-0.107	-0.100	0.075	0.082	-0.177	-0.205	-0.014	-0.016
Age	-0.013†	-0.012†	-0.022**	-0.022**	-0.016*	-0.018*	-0.011	-0.014†	0.009	0.007	0.005**	0.004**
Education	0.075	0.078	0.161	0.162	0.379*	0.372*	0.247	0.233	0.489*	0.506*	-0.026	-0.026
Firm age	-0.023**	-0.023**	0.032***	0.032***	0.004	0.005	0.012	0.014	0.001	0.005	-0.001	-0.001
Firm size	0.016*	0.016*	0.025***	0.025***	0.020**	0.020*	0.018*	0.018*	0.037**	0.035**	-0.002†	-0.002†
Education	-0.175	-0.175	-0.120	-0.121	-0.228	-0.237	-0.065	-0.079	-0.425*	-0.411*	0.301***	0.303***
Industry	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included
N	817	817	818	818	828	828	818	818	547	547	534	534
Technique	Ordered logistic regression		Ordered logistic regression		Logistic regression		Logistic regression		Logistic regression		OLS	
Wald χ^2 / F	46.21	46.04	74.85	75.11	63.05	63.05	63.79	61.43	39.4	48.39	/ 11.6	/11.63
Pseudo R ² / R ²	.028**	.028**	.038***	.038***	.062***	.062***	.069***	.067***	.071**	.085***	/.269***	/.271***
Log pseudolikelihood	-829.3	-829.26	-933.48	-933.46	-538.24	-538.24	-518.62	-519.18	-313.28	-308.67	-	-


†p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; ***p<.001. Robust standard errors in parentheses.

Table 5. Significant direct and bias corrected indirect effects

		Revenue growth	Success	Product innovation	Process innovation	Training employees	% Indigenous employees
Freedom for themselves	Direct effect	-	-	-	0.311*	-	-
	Indirect effects via:						
	Set own schedule	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Control destiny	-	-	0.3 (0.014; 0.729)**	0.283 (0.006; 0.738)**	-	-
	Community employment	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Community service	-	-0.041 (-0.106; -0.003)†	-	-0.04 (-0.108; -0.003)†	-	-
	Making declarations	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Freedom for themselves X Location	-	-	-	-	-	0.111 (0.011; 0.27)*
Freedom for the social collectivity	Direct effect	-	-	-	-	1.143**	-
	Indirect effects via:						
	Set own schedule	0.352 (0.027; 1.069)*	0.375 (0.037; 1.1)*	-	0.42 (0.045; 1.276)*	-	-
	Control destiny	-	-	-0.385 (-1.029; -0.067)*	-0.382 (-0.97; -0.05)*	-	-
	Community employment	-	-	-	-	-	0.045 (0.008; 0.11)**
	Community service	-	0.19 (0.004; 0.438)**	-	0.167 (0.027; 0.359)*	-	-
	Making declarations	-	-	-	-	-	0.126 (0.022; 0.282)*
	Freedom for social collectivity X Location	-	-	-	-	-	-0.133 (-0.389; -0.001)*

†p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; ***p<.001. All indirect effects have been tested following Hayes (2013); bootstrap bias corrected estimations for indirect effects using 5,000 random samples. Bias corrected confidence intervals are between parentheses.


14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23 **Figure 1: How does seeking autonomy affect business outcomes?**
24
25



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Figure 2: Moderation effects of location on reserve

a:



b:

